

Jennie Young, Howes Cave.
Willard C. Schadt, Jeffersonville.
Francis E. Hughes, La Fargeville.
Iva B. Locke, Lafayette.
William J. Holbert, Morrisville.
Roy Blanchard, Oneida.
Julia M. Gurnett, Watkins Glen.
Donald R. Widrick, Whitesboro.

PUERTO RICO

Jose R. Sotomayor, Barceloneta.
Leonidos M. Lopez, Camuy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JULY 3, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our blessed Lord, we pray Thee to be unto us that hidden fountain of strength that shall enable us to pluck out of life's mysteries the greatest and most abiding faith. Interfused with Thy spirit, our souls will feel the higher and more blessed enchantments of reality. While existence is written in a wounded world, life eternal is to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent.

O Spirit of the Most High, come from behind energy and matter and sin and breathe upon our hopes and our wills and cause them to live. Stay our tempers, chasten our thoughts and reign in our hearts in the fullness of Thy grace. Bless our whole family of citizens that they may not be led along false paths and be with them in their questions and problems, dispelling all fears. We pray that the Congress may rejoice our country's heart by doing the wise and splendid things for all our people. It is grandly true that Thou art our Father and as such we come to Thee for guidance and blessings to rest upon our President, our Speaker, and all Members of this legislative body; may they always create and uphold freedom and good will among all the strata of human strife and passion. For life, for sunup, for sundown, for toil and for rest we thank Thee in the name of Him who is our Elder Brother and Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of Friday, July 2, 1943, was read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved as read.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. In the consideration of the conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill, on the manganese amendments numbered 162 and 163, the Clerk read the Journal as recording the fact that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] moved to insist upon the House's disagreement and that the House insisted. The daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, however, on page 7144 of July 2, 1943, reports Mr. JOHNSON as stating:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of

the Senate Nos. 162 and 163 and concur in the same.

On the following page after the gentleman from Oklahoma had moved the previous question the Speaker stated as recorded in the RECORD:

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma to recede and concur.

Then the RECORD states that the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The RECORD is in error and will be corrected.

Mr. CASE. Of course, I am aware that the Speaker on other occasions has ruled that where there is a conflict in the report the Journal controls. And, much as I regret it, I must admit that the statement in the Journal accords with my understanding of the motion made by the gentleman from Oklahoma, as is evident from my remarks on the amendment at the time. Of course, I do not object to the approval of the Journal, but I should like to express the hope that the report of the action as given in the RECORD will be prophetic of the action that will be taken when the conferees meet again. The manganese amendment is very meritorious.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman have a request?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, for the sake of the record, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected on this point in accordance with the statement in the controlling Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY CONFERENCE

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that there have been a number of informal meetings in the Treasury between our officials and treasury representatives of foreign governments, at which many plans and projects for international monetary and credit cooperation have been discussed. These meetings, I am told, are the forerunner of an official international monetary and credit conference that will take place here in Washington during the summer months when Congress will probably be in recess.

I believe many of my fellow Members are as desirous as am I to accept our share in post-war rehabilitation but, like myself, will want to keep fully informed as to what may be our country's responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully offer the suggestion that the Chair appoint a small committee of Members who will make it their business to be present in Washington at the time of the monetary conferences I have mentioned and that they be authorized to attend all such meetings as observers, and from time to time fur-

nish the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader with reports of proceedings.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Mr. Francis Callery on the subject of contract negotiation in the aircraft industry before the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar on Monday of next week and the call of the Private Calendar on Tuesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, immediately after the legislative business of the day and other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INCOME TAX ON INCOME OF \$1,800 OR LESS

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on June 30 I introduced a bill, H. R. 3089, which would exempt from the payment of income tax all individuals who have an income of \$1,800 or less, and who have received less than a 20-percent increase in their income since 1941.

We have heard much said about the white-collar workers who have received no increase in their pay, and we know that it is necessary to give these people relief in some way. There have been proposals made, such as food stamps and roll-back in prices, but I think the simplest and least expensive way would be to exempt these people from the payment of income tax.

You heard in the President's message that we have 4,000,000 families in the United States who have had not over a 5-percent raise in their income in the last 2 or 3 years. This bill would give these people what would amount to a small increase in pay, or be equal to a roll-back in the prices of the necessities of life.

I made this same proposal when I tried to amend the tax law, and I am now bringing the proposition to you in the form of a bill. I hope that the Members of the House will give this matter their serious consideration.

THE FOOD SHORTAGE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just been in conference with Mr. Bruce F. Hardy, of Scottsburg, Ind., a distinguished farm leader of the Middle West, who has been spending a few days here in Washington. I wish every Member of Congress could have heard his comments on the food situation as a result of his own personal observations.

I will give you a brief summary of what he had to say:

Food shortages, bad as they are at present, have only begun to make themselves felt. Because of 8 years of relatively good crops, including last year's record breaker, people have been led to believe we could never have a shortage of food in this country. Good crop weather was largely responsible for this long period of good crops. Yet we have meat rationing with more hogs and cattle on the farms than ever before; corn product plants closed with almost a thousand million bushels of corn in storage. Our dairy, poultry, and other livestock farmers are having great difficulties to secure feeds for their animals to produce maximum and efficient results.

Bungling by Washington idealistic dreamers in trying to solve the food problem is apparent to all. The triple cover-up "Wickard to Davis to Jones" only adds to the confusion since it is well known that none of these were permitted to establish and carry out a national food policy. Food policies have been conceived by swivel-chair theorists such as Cohen, Ezekiel, and others, while responsibility for their execution was passed to the administration by the White House.

Farmers want no subsidies or roll-backs, but feel that as producers of vital war necessities they should not be penalized because they do not blindly follow the administration in its senseless food policies. Our consuming public will wake up with a start before snow flies again, with the realization that it takes more than directives from city-bred White House advisers to direct wartime production and distribution of food products.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

THE VOTE ON THE PRESIDENT'S VETO

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. VURSELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE FOOD SITUATION IN THE LAST WAR

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I have listened several times today to different gentlemen speaking about the President's inflationary program, as they term the food-control program. Let me call the attention of those gentlemen to the fact that I was in the last war. I

came home, and what did I find? I was practicing law when I left for the war and had to start practicing again upon my return. I found that in my own city cotton yarn No. 60, which is now selling at 60 cents a pound, was \$3.65 a pound. I found coffee in my own town when I wanted to buy it priced at 75 cents a pound. I found bacon at 60 cents a pound; sugar 30 cents per pound. Gentlemen forget what the American people had to pay for food during the last war and after the last war. They should be grateful for the program of this administration. I call their attention now, briefly, to what one great man said some years ago when he had addressed Congress. He said:

Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation.

That was said by President Lincoln in his message to the Congress in December 1862. I hope and pray that our speech and conduct these days will light us down to honor to the last generation.

CANNING SITUATION IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, on June 21 I had the privilege of addressing this House in connection with grade labeling, referring particularly to the canned-foods industry in California. I stated at that time that 10 percent of the Nation's agricultural products are produced in California. California is making an outstanding contribution to the war effort; not only food but war materials as well.

This morning I am much disturbed by contents of a telegram setting forth conditions facing the canning industry in my State. I would like to read this telegram which comes from the California Conserving Co. of San Francisco:

The canning crops in California in many instances have already been grown and canned. Others will start to be processed within the next few weeks. The Office of Price Administration has given us no price at which we can sell this merchandise. Warehouses are full and financing becoming more difficult. Unless Office of Price Administration can be forced into action it will cause price losses to growers and canners, as it will be impossible to put up the pack. Urge upon you that we must have action on this. Congress is the only one that can do it and for the welfare of the Nation it should not adjourn until it does.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include a short poem written by a constituent of mine, now in the armed forces, as a tribute to his mother.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

DEFICIT SPENDING

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, a father who is regularly wasting his wages getting drunk and wrecking his home always blames the suffering of his family on someone else. After making economic whoopee for more than 10 years, the New Deal is likewise trying to make someone else the goat.

Trouble for a spendthrift does not begin when his debts come due. His trouble becomes certain when he spends the borrowed money. The deficit spending which makes inflation began 12 years ago. Mr. Roosevelt said in 1932:

If a nation * * * extends its taxing to the limit * * * and continues to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy.

President Roosevelt pledged himself to stop the deficits that create inflation and bankruptcy. Has he kept that promise? A \$118,000,000,000 increase in the Government debt is the factual answer.

Yesterday President Roosevelt's veto message expressed concern about the cost of living. His words about inflation should be measured against his actions of the past 10 years. There is no other yardstick.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include two radio addresses I made last night over two different stations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HALE was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a resolution adopted by the Sons of the Revolution of New York State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. LANDIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short statement taken from a speech I delivered over the Mutual network last night.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to re-

wise and extend my remarks and include therein an article from the Antigo Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

STABILIZATION OF CURRENCY

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. CRAWFORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief address by a constituent at Indianapolis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from the first inaugural address of Thomas Jefferson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a telegram and I also ask permission to extend my remarks in one other instance and include a letter from Mr. Brown, head of the Office of Price Administration.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE CORN CRISIS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, corn is no longer a problem; it is a crisis. The manufacturers are sending wires and letters frantically appealing for corn. Feeders are clamoring for corn; industrial processors, many of whom have already closed their operations, are clamoring for corn. This thing is a crisis that must be met. I have discussed the thing with various authorities in government and have urged immediate action to meet the dilemma in which industry, feeders, feed manufacturers, and others presently find themselves.

It occurs to me there are two approaches to this problem. One is the modification of the corn ceiling, but they must go further than that. There must be some relief from corn consumption in the form of feeding heavy livestock; something must be done to induce the movement of heavy hogs and beef cattle to market. The thing will not wait and I am anxious and hopeful that the

War Food Administrator will go into the question at once.

An order was issued this week that, in my judgment, will not meet the problem. It will not induce corn into the market. The order provides that where corn is brought to the market between July 1 and August 10 the Commodity Credit Corporation, through its country elevators as agents, gives assurance to the producers of such corn that they will be protected against any rise in the price of corn up to October 31. This, however, is nullified by the next paragraph in the order which states that no increase in the ceiling price of corn is contemplated. Unless action is taken forthwith, not only corn processors and feed manufacturers will be in dire straits but textile mills, bakers, candy manufacturers, and a host of others as well. The time for action is now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Disabled American Veterans Magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. SUMNERS of Texas addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address made last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

DIVISION OF LEGISLATIVE POWERS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] called attention to the fact that the Constitution vests the legislative power of the United States in the two Houses of Congress. When he said Congress he meant the two Houses of Congress.

About a week ago Friday this House took action which brought congratulatory messages by wire and letter, but

since that time over at the other end of the corridor a veto has been put on that economy legislation for which the House was so highly praised. It occurs to me that perhaps the gentleman from Texas may be somewhat mistaken in saying that the legislative powers rest in the two Houses of Congress. It seems that we might better obtain the attitude of the other body and learn what they want us to do before we take action. I understand this question of firing the fellows with left wing ideas is coming up again today. I for one intend to vote to keep them off the Federal pay roll, inasmuch as our economy drive has been defeated by the Senate and the House accepted that defeat. Those who voted to accept it and who were congratulated might well notify those who wrote them of the final result.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and insert therein a very brief and very appreciative statement made by the Prime Minister of Canada and the leaders of the opposition parties concerning the recent Interparliamentary Conference and the delegation from our Congress which was invited and attended the conference in Ottawa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXPENSES, INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts I submit the following resolution (H. Res. 284), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 98, Seventy-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$12,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee thereof conducting such investigation or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

EMERGENCY FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up conference report on S. 1134, a bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1134) to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and other purposes having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the sum of \$10,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by the recent floods: *Provided*, That pending the appropriation of said sum the Secretary of War may allot from existing flood-control appropriations such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made: *Provided further*, That funds allotted under this authority shall not be diverted from the unobligated funds from the appropriation 'Flood control, general,' made available in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1944, for specific purposes therein enumerated.

"Sec. 2. The provisions of Section 1 shall be deemed to be additional and supplemental to, and not in lieu of, existing general legislation authorizing allocation of flood-control funds for restoration of flood-control works threatened or destroyed by flood.

"Sec. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to suspend all quota provisions and other limitations with respect to the production of agricultural commodities on any lands affected by floods in 1943 whenever he finds that crops have been destroyed or plantings interfered with or washed out on said lands by reason of such floods, and he is further authorized to permit the maximum planting on such lands of any crops which are essential to the war effort, without the imposition of any penalty or the withholding of any benefit, soil conservation, or other agricultural payments.

"Sec. 4. The War Production Board, and every other governmental agency which has jurisdiction over allocations and priorities relating to farm machinery and equipment, are authorized and directed immediately to take such steps as may be necessary to provide for the necessary allocations and priorities to enable farmers in the areas affected by floods in 1943 to replace and repair their farm machinery and equipment which was destroyed or damaged by such floods, and to continue farming operations."

And the House agree to the same.

WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
A. J. ELLIOTT,
CHARLES R. CLASON,
CARL T. CURTIS,

Managers on the part of the House.

JOHN H. OVERTON,
BENNETT C. CLARK,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1134) entitled "A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such an amendment, namely:

AMENDMENT

The Senate bill included H. R. 3010 with the committee amendment reported by the House Committee on Flood Control. In addition to including the provisions of the House bill, section 2 authorized the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to aid in the rehabilitation, including the necessary relocation, protection, and elevation above flood plane, of railroads engaged in interstate commerce whose properties have been destroyed or damaged in whole or in part by flood in 1943, to make loans not to exceed at any one time \$25,000,000, at a rate of interest not to exceed 3 percent, upon such terms and conditions and with such security as the Corporation may prescribe. Under existing law the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make such loans to railroads upon the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission when such railroads are unable to obtain funds upon reasonable terms through banking channels or from the public, but requires adequate security, and the rate of interest is left to the discretion of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which Corporation is authorized to make the loans at a rate in excess of or less than 3 percent. The loans heretofore made are generally at the rate of 4 percent, although other loans are made to railroads at rates of interest less than 3 percent. The proposed section eliminated the requirement of adequate security and eliminated other requirements of existing law. There is adequate existing law to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make rehabilitation loans to railroads. The proposed section 2 would have changed existing law. The section was eliminated in conference.

Section 4 of the Senate bill authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to suspend quota provisions on any lands affected by floods in 1943. All quota provisions have been suspended except the provisions on cotton and tobacco. It is too late to plant either cotton or tobacco for 1943. The proposed section 4 does not, therefore, change existing law. It was agreed to with an amendment that no penalty would be imposed for exceeding the quotas and that no benefit soil conservation or other agricultural payment would be withheld for exceeding the quotas in 1943.

Section 5 of the said Senate bill directed the War Production Board and every other governmental agency having jurisdiction over allocations and priorities relating to farm machinery and equipment to provide the necessary allocations and priorities to enable farmers in the areas affected by floods in 1943 to replace and repair their farm machinery and equipment which was destroyed or damaged by such floods. The said section is in accord with the policy that has been adopted by the War Production Board; in fact, the War Production Board has provided for the actual shipment of farm machinery and equipment into all areas where requests have been made, affected by the floods in 1943. No change is made, therefore, by this amendment in the existing law or regulations.

The House struck out all after the enacting clause in said Senate 1134 and inserted in lieu thereof the provisions of the House bill with the committee amendment as reported by the Committee on Flood Control.

The conference report agrees to the provisions of the House bill as passed by the House, which had been previously included in the

bill. It eliminates section 2 of the Senate bill with respect to rehabilitation loans to railroads. It includes section 4 of the Senate bill with respect to quotas with the amendments eliminating penalties and making secure benefit payments. It also retains section 5 of the bill providing for priorities for farm machinery and equipment in flooded areas.

WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
A. J. ELLIOTT,
CHARLES R. CLASON,
CARL T. CURTIS,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that the Senate bill included H. R. 3010, reported by the Committee on Flood Control. The bill was considered in the Senate before it was considered in the House. In addition to the provisions of the House bill the Senate bill included a provision authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans not to exceed \$25,000,000 for the rehabilitation of railroads to pay for the raising of their tracks and to make improvements above the flood plane where they were damaged or destroyed by flood in 1943. It provided that those loans should be made upon such security as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation might prescribe and at a rate of interest not to exceed 3 percent. Under existing law rehabilitation loans to railroads are authorized, but they are required to be made, Mr. Speaker, upon adequate security and after approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission and after it had been shown to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that such loans could not be obtained from private sources. The existing law is sufficient for railroads that need rehabilitation funds.

The provision in the Senate bill would have changed existing law and would have eliminated the requirement for adequate and full security, and would have eliminated the provision that the railroads must obtain the funds from private sources if they were available. The provision for loans to railroads is section 2 of the Senate bill. In addition to the elimination of the requirement for adequate security and the requirement that the railroads must show that they were unable to obtain funds upon reasonable terms from banking channels or from the public, the section provided for a rate of interest not to exceed 3 percent. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has made many loans to railroads. I understand that the aggregate of these loans is about one-half billion dollars. The rate of interest for loans for rehabilitation is generally 4 percent. Large loans have been made to railroads for equipment. I am advised that the rates of interest on these loans vary. In some cases the rate is less than 3 percent.

Under existing law the matter of rates is for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It is not the province of the Committee on Flood Control to provide for financing railroads, farms, or other properties. Such is the function of the Committee on Banking and Currency. The loan provision has no place in a flood control bill. The Committee on Flood

Control conducted extensive hearings. There was no showing before the Committee on Flood Control to justify the loans. The proposed section for rehabilitation loans to enable railroads to relocate and elevate their tracks above the flood plane and to repair and rebuild bridges at a rate not to exceed 3 per cent interest would have changed the existing law with respect to loans to railroads. It would have eliminated many of the restrictions imposed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation upon railroads. I am advised that loans were not made to railroads until the salaries of officials were readjusted and in many cases reduced. If the rate of interest for \$25,000,000 is made less than 4 per cent, the railroads that are paying more than 3 per cent with adequate security could well afford to ask Congress to reduce the rates of interest.

Again, the authorization of \$10,000,000 is to repair flood-control works that may protect railroads, farms, and cities. All classes of property are given equal treatment. No loans are provided for farms or for city property. The Disaster Loan Corporation makes provision for such loans. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation in its discretion may make the rates of interest for rehabilitation loans 3 per cent. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation may charge 4 per cent or less. It may charge 3 per cent, more or less. In all the circumstances it was deemed unwise to change the existing law, especially with regard to the requirement for adequate security and the rates of interest. Section 2 of the bill, as it passed the Senate, which provided for rehabilitation loans to railroads, was therefore eliminated in conference.

The bill as agreed to is set forth in the conference report. It is the House bill, also embraced in the Senate bill, with the farm quota and machinery provisions of the Senate bill, which are really existing law, and regulations.

The Senate bill contained a provision, which is section 4, that authorized the suspension of quotas on flooded lands for the year 1943. That is existing law except on cotton and tobacco and it is entirely too late for any cotton or tobacco to be planted. This provision of the bill, as I say, is in accordance with existing law and with the existing regulations of the Department of Agriculture.

There was another provision in the Senate bill, which is section 5, that authorized and directed the War Production Board to make available for the flooded areas repairs and replacement for machinery and equipment damaged or destroyed by the floods in 1943. The War Production Board advised that those provisions have already been made and that shipments have been made into the area as requested, so that provision of the Senate bill is in accordance with existing law and existing regulations. The conference report therefore embraces the bill as it passed the House in the identical language as it passed the House, with a repetition of existing law and regulations as to quotas on farm machinery, which in my judgment are wholly unnecessary and only repeat.

The provision with respect to loans to railroads was not according to existing law and is eliminated. The provision suspending quotas, without eliminating benefit payments, and the provision for the shipment of farm machinery and farm machinery repair parts into the flooded areas are according to existing law and regulations, and, while unnecessary, are retained.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. Are we to understand that the bill as it comes from the conferees is in its original House form?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With the exception of the two provisions to which I referred, both of which are provided for by existing law and are unnecessary in my personal opinion, but to agree to the main provisions which are the House bill they were retained in the bill.

Mr. PLOESER. At any rate there is no new provision contrary to existing law or broadening existing law as it affects the railroads?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is right. The bill is substantially as it passed the House. The gentleman will recall that when the bill was considered in the House we struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and the House bill was substituted.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Can the gentleman state whether or not the bill in the form now proposed will restrict the use of these funds to the repair of destroyed levees or whether it will permit the building of such additional levees or such other emergency steps as the Chief of Engineers may determine to be necessary?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I said, Mr. Speaker, the bill as it comes from the conference committee retains the exact language of the House bill, and that language was written into the Senate bill. It provides \$10,000,000 to repair, restore, and strengthen levees and other flood-control works, which have been threatened or destroyed by recent floods. It is only applicable where the Federal Government has constructed levees or other flood-control works or where the local interests have constructed levees or other flood-control works, and for such repairs or restorations as are necessary. There is a provision that pertains for the first time to strengthening the levees or other flood-control works that are built in the future to take the place of those destroyed, or other works that may be needed in the nature of repairs or minor improvements to existing works.

Mr. CASE. When I appeared before the gentleman's committee in the course of my testimony and other testimony, attention was drawn to cases where there were no existing levees, and, if I remember correctly, the division engineer testified that in many cases the levees that had been built by local communities were entirely inadequate, were not long enough, or were not high enough in some instances.

In some places there were no levees. The increasing of the velocity of the stream by reason of other river improvements created flood damage where there had been no need for levees before. If the bill is restricted to strengthening existing levees, it does not do anything for those areas where there were no levees previously.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. All levees and other flood-control works are treated exactly alike. It has been the policy of the Committee on Flood Control to approve projects recommended by the Chief of Engineers rather than to turn over to either the Executive or to the Chief of Engineers lump-sum appropriations to enable them to expend the money at their discretion. If there are no existing works the policy is for those works to be authorized. The Flood Control Committee hopes to report a bill later on this session to provide for improvements where there are no works at this time, but this bill is for the repair of existing works and for emergency purposes.

Mr. CASE. The testimony before the gentleman's committee, and I do not refer to mine alone but to others, pointed out that to protect existing levees some new levees were necessary; that the straightening of the channel in certain cases had speeded up the water so that a mere strengthening of existing levees alone would not meet the needs of the situation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There are cases where local people—and cases where the Federal Government has aided in the construction through the Work Projects Administration—have constructed levees that were utterly inadequate. The only provision that Congress can make is to repair those levees, strengthen the part where they are built, and do whatever is necessary to strengthen, then secure an authorization later on to rebuild, the entire levee line.

Mr. CASE. Does the gentleman's committee contemplate considering further legislation to take care of the deficiencies in the flood-control system as revealed by the testimony before his committee?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I so stated when this bill was under consideration. The committee has conducted hearings and plans to report a comprehensive bill. The gentleman will recall that there are no appropriations for national flood control for the next fiscal year. We hope to report a bill to provide for such cases as he has mentioned and for other works that the Chief of Engineers recommends and to provide for their construction as soon as funds are made available.

Mr. BISHOP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BISHOP. Do part of these funds go to clean up debris and help build fences and clean up the areas that have been flooded?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; this bill has only to do with flood-control work. There is existing legislation providing for disaster loans to farmers and for the

rehabilitation of farmers where they need livestock that has been destroyed.

Mr. BISHOP. How about drainage ditches that would be appropriate to drain such areas?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If there are no flood works, no. What may be called, and are sometimes called, drainage districts are included in this bill if the levees or other flood-control works are damaged or destroyed, along the rivers or other streams.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Can the gentleman tell me the effect of the proviso starting in line 17, page 2?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I do not understand the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Tell me the effect of the proviso starting in line 17, page 2, of the bill: "The funds allotted under this authority shall not be diverted from unobligated funds," and so forth.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I understand now that the gentleman refers to the Senate bill, line 17, page 2. As stated, when this bill was before the House, that proviso excepted from funds that might be allotted payment of \$250,000 to the city of Hartford, Conn., and funds that have been allotted for the construction of projects in Louisiana authorized by the act of August 1941. Those provisions, wholly unnecessary, in my judgment, merely affirm existing law on the two propositions as provided by the War Department Civil Appropriation Act of 1944, in my personal judgment being unjustifiable, and do not contain any new legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is the same item of \$252,000 that was in a bill recently passed?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes. It is the exception carried in the War Department civil appropriation bill. It should not have been in the House bill, because I think all projects ought to be treated exactly alike, and handled and construed as provided by law, but it does not change existing law, and only unnecessarily repeats.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], chairman of the Committee on Flood Control, and his committee of managers on the part of the House, on the excellent bill that they have brought back from conference. It is practical, it is workable, and it answers an imperative need. I appreciate the reference in the report to the incorporation of provisions from my bill as a part of the measure. Only those who have actually visited the scenes of devastation along the banks of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers and their tributaries can appreciate the destruction wrought by the recent recurring floods. It exceeds any-

thing suffered within the memory of this generation.

The assistance of the Federal Government provided for in this bill must be made available immediately. There is hardly a day to lose. The measure formulated by the gentleman from Mississippi and his committee, as it passed the House and as he brings it back practically intact from conference, will provide for the more urgent needs. Under it no new construction can be built. That must wait the Public Works program at the close of the war. But it provides for essential repairs of existing facilities. The destruction has been so great and so widespread that unless the Government does come to the rescue of this productive section in the Middle West, it will be impossible with local means and facilities to take care of the situation.

There has been no authorization for the expenditure of money provided at this session of the Congress that means so much in proportion to the amount involved as this measure does in providing for the rehabilitation of agriculture and the restoration of production in the heart of the breadbasket of the Nation. It is directly associated with the war effort in the protection of an area which under normal conditions produces vastly in excess of its quota of the Nation's food.

I am especially gratified that provision is made for strengthening and raising preexisting levees. Heretofore, under the statute, money could not be expended to increase the height of levees beyond their pre-flood status. Under this bill as reported it will be possible to increase the height of such works to a point indicated by actual flood experience as necessary to provide complete protection.

I am glad to have had an opportunity to collaborate with the gentleman and his committee and trust we can secure prompt and favorable action under the authorization of the pending bill when the last deficiency appropriation bill is returned from the Senate.

In addition to the money provided for repair of levees, an authorization for an appropriation of \$15,000,000 has been added by Senator CLARK of Missouri to the deficiency bill for loans for farmers in flood devastated areas to enable them to resume production. I was able to change this authorization to a direct appropriation in conference between the House and Senate and the money will be available at once through the Farm Security Administration.

While Federal assistance is limited to repairs during the war, extensive and comprehensive plans for permanent flood control are being drafted to include reservoirs, dams, levees, and channel improvements, on which surplus labor will be employed during the post-war period.

In this connection, I include as of particular interest to those sections drained by the Missouri River, a letter just received from Major General Reybold:

JULY 1, 1943.

HON. CLARENCE CANNON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CANNON: The Department has received your letter of May 29, 1943, with

reference to improvements on the Missouri River. Accompanying letters express the opinion that improvements for navigation conflict with those for flood control and comment upon the effectiveness of reservoirs for flood-control purposes. It is urged that levee protection along the Missouri River be provided as early as possible. In your letter you ask for information on these subjects and for the comments of the Department on these remarks about flood-control reservoirs.

The Department has made extensive investigations of the navigation and flood-control problems in the Missouri River Basin and has recommended improvements to Congress for the solution of a number of those problems. Navigation improvements which have been authorized by Congress and constructed by this Department have been successful by providing a channel in a definitely fixed location in the flood plain of the river. The Fort Peck Reservoir, recently completed in the headwaters of the basin, now provides a regulated minimum flow in the channel to insure sufficient depth for navigation purposes and, in addition, provides storage capacity which reduces substantially the flood flows downstream.

The Flood Control Acts of June 22, 1936, June 28, 1938, and August 18, 1941, authorize the construction of a number of flood-control works throughout the Missouri River Basin, of which the more important are a comprehensive plan of reservoirs for flood control and other purposes and systems of levees and other protective works between Sioux City and Kansas City and at the Kansas Citys. The Department is now making additional investigations of the need for further improvements for flood control in this basin, and such further improvements as may be recommended as a result of those investigations will be submitted to Congress at the earliest practicable date. The improvements both for navigation and flood control so far accomplished have constituted the first step for the development of the Missouri River for flood control, navigation, and other beneficial purposes.

Before the Missouri River Valley was settled the river during floods overflowed the channel banks and spread out over the flood plain, which thus served as a reservoir temporarily holding back a large portion of the flood waters until the waters in the lower part of the valley receded. As settlement of the valley progressed there has been a continuous encroachment by the works of man on the flood plain which reduced this temporary reservoir capacity and increased flood heights all along the river. These man-made works include highways, railroads, bridges, levees, and many other types of structures which have become of increasing importance to the economic progress of the valley. This has created the problem not only of overcoming the loss of natural storage in the valley but also of providing adequate flood protection for the encroachments upon that natural storage wherever such protection is economically and physically feasible.

Adequate flood protection in the Missouri Valley cannot be provided by levees alone, but it can be satisfactorily accomplished by a balanced plan of storage reservoirs, levees, and channel improvements. In some of the reservoirs it will be possible to utilize the water resources at those sites for the development of hydroelectric power without sacrificing the usefulness of the reservoirs for the necessary storage of water for flood-control purposes. The improvements now authorized for flood control, navigation, and other purposes in the basin form an essential first unit of the overall development needed for the control of the many water problems which exist in this basin. When completed, those improvements will afford a substantial degree of flood protection for many of the areas which have been damaged so heavily during past floods.

As you are undoubtedly aware, existing policies on wartime construction established by higher authority preclude the initiation of construction of additional public-works improvements during the war, unless a definite showing can be made by the Federal war agency directly concerned with the facilities to be protected that the construction work is essential to the war effort. The purpose of these limitations is, of course, to conserve critical materials, construction equipment, and manpower for the successful prosecution of the war.

You may be assured that the Department is prepared to undertake the further accomplishment of the adopted plan of reservoirs and local protection works for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin as soon as the existing limitations on public-works construction are removed, subject to the availability of authorizations and funds.

I am pleased to state that section 5 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, authorizes the Secretary of War to allot from flood-control appropriations not to exceed \$1,000,000 for any one fiscal year, to be expended in rescue work or in the repair or maintenance of any flood-control work destroyed by flood. The Department's district engineers in the Missouri River area are now making investigations of the levees damaged by the recent floods on the Missouri River to determine the need for Federal assistance in repair work under this authority. I may assure you that the Department will assist as much as possible in the restoration of the levees damaged by the recent floods on the Missouri River within the limits of the existing authority and available funds.

Although the preliminary estimates of the division and district engineers in the areas where the recent disastrous floods occurred indicate that the total costs of essential repairs to existing flood control works damaged by those floods will far exceed the authorization and funds now available to the Department for such repairs, I may assure you that the Department will assist as much as possible in the restoration of the levees along the Missouri River.

As you know, legislation has recently been introduced in Congress which, if enacted, would provide additional authorization for the Department to accomplish the work now required to repair flood-control structures damaged by the recent floods in the central and southwestern parts of the country. That legislation is contained in the bills S. 1134, House Joint Resolution 132, H. R. 3010, and other bills.

The enclosures which were enclosed with your letter are returned herewith as requested.

Very truly yours,

E. REYBOLD,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman explain sections 2, 3, 4 of the report in connection with the farm land situation?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have already explained that. The bill as reported by the conferees contains a provision that quotas shall not be applicable, on lands affected by floods in 1943, and that quotas for said year shall be suspended without prejudice.

Mr. STEFAN. The quota program will not apply to those lands?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It does not apply for the year 1943. The provision is wholly unnecessary because quotas do not apply except in the case of cotton and

tobacco anyway, and it is too late to plant cotton or tobacco.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman anticipates an appropriation to carry on this work and that will come to us in the form of a deficiency bill, as explained by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF AN ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2801) to provide for the appointment of an additional assistant secretary of the Interior.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is this a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The committee went into the matter rather carefully and reported the bill unanimously.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Why do they need any more assistant secretaries of the Interior? It seems to me they have enough.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The work has been greatly increased recently. The duties of Coordinator of Fisheries have recently been placed upon the Secretary. Also, more than 200,000 licenses have already been issued under the Explosives Act we passed. The problems of the war have brought additional problems in the various territories. The coal situation has also added a number of duties. The Committee on the Public Lands is a rather conservative committee. We went into this matter rather thoroughly and decided that the additional position is needed, but we limited it to the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter.

Mr. TABER. It is limited, then; it is temporary?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the gentleman give details as to what he means when he says the work has materially increased in the Territories?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I am more familiar with Alaska than the other Territories or possessions. I am not a member of the Committee on the Territories. I know that in Alaska in connection with certain lands on which there were leases the leases have had to be suspended and the people have had to move out of certain areas. I am not

familiar with the other Territories and possessions.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, for instance?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I am not familiar with them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman has no information on them?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. No.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is to be the salary of this assistant secretary of the Interior?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Nine thousand dollars.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is his title to be Assistant Secretary?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. We say there shall be no rank as between the assistant secretaries.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. He is to be an assistant secretary?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I object, Mr. Speaker.

STATUE OF SIR WILLIAM BLACKSTONE

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2106) to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Sir William Blackstone, the work of the late Paul V. Bartlett, and for other purposes. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand that under this bill there is to be no cost to the Government?

Mr. O'TOOLE. There will be a cost of about \$10,000 for the pedestal and to landscape the grounds.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Where is this statue to be located?

Mr. BULWINKLE. If the gentleman will yield, it is to be located on Judiciary Square in the city of Washington.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman kindly give the House the benefit of his knowledge about the proposal?

Mr. BULWINKLE. This is a very interesting matter. Mr. Justice Groner, of the Court of Appeals, requested that I introduce this bill.

In 1923 the American Bar Association was invited to be the guest of the English bar in London. At that time the American Bar Association was going to present a statue of Sir William Blackstone to the bar of England. Mr. Paul W. Bartlett, a famous sculptor, was selected to do the statue. However, the plaster cast he took over there was found to be a little large, so he had another cast made. Mr. Bartlett died after he completed the second statue. Mrs. Bartlett, at her own expense, took the first plaster cast to a foundry in Belgium and had the statue cast in bronze and brought it back to the United States. She wanted to give to the United States this heroic statue of Sir William Blackstone. It cost

her something over \$25,000, I understand. Justice Groner, Chief Justice Stone, and others have been very much interested in having the United States accept this statue. It will cost about \$10,000 for the pedestal and for landscaping the grounds.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to accept, on behalf of the United States, the bronze statue of Sir William Blackstone, the work of the late Paul W. Bartlett, as a gift from Mrs. Paul W. Bartlett, and, with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, to provide for the erection of such statue at a suitable location on the north side of Judiciary Square in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for carrying out the provisions of this act, including the procurement of a suitable pedestal for such statue.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, under the special order previously agreed to, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 2714 and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 131]

Baldwin, Md.	Green	Norton
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hall	O'Brien, Ill.
Barden	Edwin A.	O'Hara
Barry	Hart	O'Leary
Boykin	Hébert	Philbin
Bradley, Mich.	Holifield	Phillips
Cannon, Fla.	Izac	Plumley
Capozzoli	Johnson	Poage
Cochran	Ward	Pracht
Cole, N. Y.	Kee	Robison, Ky.
Culkin	Kennedy	Russell
Dawson	Kilburn	Sasser
Dickstein	King	Satterfield
Drewry	Kleberg	Shafer
Eaton	Lesinski	Snyder
Elmer	McCormack	Stevenson
Fay	McKenzie	Summers, Tex.
Fitzpatrick	Magnuson	Tolan
Ford	Maloney	Treadway
Fulmer	Mansfield, Tex.	Van Zandt
Furlong	Mason	Vinson, Ga.
Gallagher	May	Wadsworth
Gerlach	Merritt	Ward
Gifford	Morrow	
Gillie	Miller, Penn.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 360 members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings, under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made upon the conference report today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2935) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 to said bill; that the Senate recedes from its amendment numbered 30; that the Senate further insists upon its amendment numbered 24, disagreed to by the House, agrees to a further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. WHITE to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Acting President pro tempore had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Executive Office of the President (War Production Board).

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the conferees.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate Numbered 5, 60, and 61 to the bill (H. R. 2714) "making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes" having met,

after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by such amendment and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the action of the Senate and House of Representatives, insert the following: "Provided, That no part of such fund shall be available after June 30, 1943, for allocation to finance a function or project for which function or project a budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the Seventy-eighth Congress and such appropriation denied after consideration thereof by the Senate and House of Representatives or by the Committees on Appropriations of both bodies"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by such amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 304. No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this Act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other Act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used, after November 15, 1943, to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Junior, and Robert Morris Lovett, unless prior to such date such person has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: Provided, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for leaves of absence or salary, or of any refund or reimbursement, which have accrued prior to November 15, 1943: Provided further, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for services performed as a member of a jury or as a member of the armed forces of the United States nor any benefit, pension, or emolument resulting therefrom."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The Committee of Conference report in disagreement Senate amendment No. 61.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,

Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH McKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, Jr.,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate Nos. 5, 60, and 61 to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended as to each of such amendments in the accompanying conference report, namely:

No. 5. The original House bill carried provision extending until June 30, 1944, the unexpended balance in the President's emergency fund on June 30, 1943, and to this provision the House added a prohibition on the use of the fund for making allocations to the National Resources Planning Board and the Farm Security Administration. The Senate struck out this provision and inserted language of a general character restricting the use of the fund. The House adopted the Senate proposed language modified so as to make the exemptions made applicable by the Senate to the War and Navy Departments likewise applicable to the Department of State and the Office of Strategic Services. To this the Senate added exemption for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. All other Federal agencies remained subject to the proposed Senate language as subsequently modified. The conference agreement omits the House restrictions relating to the National Resources Planning Board and the Farm Security Administration and substitutes, for the original proposed Senate general restrictive language as modified by the House and again by the Senate, the following limitation: "Provided, That no part of such fund shall be available after June 30, 1943, for allocation to finance a function or project for which function or project a budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the Seventy-eighth Congress and such appropriation denied after consideration thereof by the Senate and House of Representatives or by the Committees on Appropriations of both bodies."

No. 60. The House bill, by section 304, contains a prohibition on the use of any Federal funds, after the date of the enactment of the bill, for continuing in Federal employment Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Junior, and Robert Morris Lovett. The Senate struck out this section. The conference agreement restores the section modified so as to prohibit the use of Federal funds for their employment after November 15, 1943, unless such persons prior to that date have been appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

No. 61. Corrects a section number; the amendment is reported in disagreement. The House managers will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment correcting the Section number and inserting a paragraph to make appropriations in the bill, or portions of appropriations, available for obligation in the fiscal year 1944, retroactive to July 1, 1943.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is satisfactory to nobody, but, I trust, acceptable to everybody. If I were free to write it, I would write it differently. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] were writing it he would indite a still different version. In fact, any Member of either the House or the Senate conferees, and, so far as I am aware, any Member of either the House or the Senate, if he were writing this conference report as he would prefer to have it, would write it quite differently, and the likelihood is that no two transcripts would agree. The conference report meets the wishes of nobody in every respect, and therein lies its virtue; it is a compromise on

which, with mutual concessions, all of us can unite.

There are only two points of variance: One relates to control of the President's fund. Under the limitations imposed by the two Houses in the original draft of the bill, the fund would have been, to all practical intents and purposes, practically inoperative. Now it goes without saying that an emergency fund at the disposal of the Commander in Chief, from which allocations can be made in emergencies or in secret war operations, is indispensable in modern warfare. No war has been fought in modern times by any country without such provision. It follows, then, that limitations hampering the use of the fund are to that extent inimical to the successful prosecution of the war, and the committee of conference report back a provision under which restrictions on the use of the fund are limited to objects for which estimates by the Bureau of the Budget have been denied by the two Houses or the respective Committees on Appropriation thereof.

The second item—and the item perhaps more directly in the public eye—is that denying salaries to three Federal employees charged with subversive affiliations. On this item the two Houses have disagreed diametrically and emphatically. Each has repeatedly sustained its position by record votes and perverted oratory both in conference and on the floor.

May I briefly address myself to those Members of the House who insist that the House refuse to compose the differences on this item by mutual concessions. I appreciate the position that they take; but, Mr. Speaker, there is a very ancient document—too frequently overlooked in these hectic days—called the Constitution of the United States. In that majestic document provision is made whereby the Senate of the United States is constituted a part of the Government of the United States, and on terms of equality with the House. The Senate has voted five separate times on roll call that it will not accept the House language, and on one of those calls the vote stood 68 to 0.

And when it is noted that the House has also voted three times just as emphatically that it will not recede from its position, we have what amounts to the irresistible force meeting the immovable object.

Now it was for just such situations that the machinery of conference was devised. Committees representing both Houses meet around a table in conference for the purpose of securing an agreement; meet and discuss the issues in order to harmonize the differences between the two bodies, meet in an effort to reach a compromise on which both Houses will undertake to agree. That has been the course followed in this all but historic instance. We have met in conference in an endeavor to reach common ground on which we might formulate a measure satisfactory to all concerned—and especially satisfactory to the forgotten and uncompensated employees of the Government waiting a check for salary now 2 days past due.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I say to the gentleman from Missouri that the Senate leaves the House in a very ridiculous position. We have taken 400 pages of testimony and exhibits on these three gentlemen. The Senate never took one shred of testimony of either Mr. Dodd or Mr. Watson, and only the statement of Secretary Ickes with respect to Mr. Lovett, and so after all of the testimony heard by a distinguished special committee of this House, I confess the Senate does leave us in a very difficult position. I cannot reconcile myself to it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I confess, Mr. Speaker, I find myself in much the same frame of mind as the gentleman from Illinois. I agree that much of the disagreement is apparently due to lack of information on the subject in dispute between the two Houses. For example, it has been frequently insisted in debate that these three men have not had an opportunity to present their side of the case, that they have not been given a fair trial, that they have not had their day in court.

In order to dispell any such erroneous impression it is only necessary to turn to pages 119, 157, and 199 of the hearings which I shall not take the time of the House to read but in which the three men themselves respectively assure the subcommittee of their appreciation of the courtesy accorded them and the opportunity afforded them to present every possible argument and evidence in their own behalf. To any who entertain any doubt as to the fairness and integrity of the proceedings, let me recommend even a cursory perusal of the printed transcript of the hearings which are available to all on request. All three of these men, without exception, told the committee they had been treated with every consideration, that they had been given every facility and had fully presented their case and that they appreciated the courtesy shown them by the committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes more.

I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that the House language should stand. I am at a loss to understand why anyone at all familiar with the situation should not be willing to accept it. But the Senate has settled convictions to the contrary and has not hesitated to express them and under the Constitution they have that right. Ours is a bicameral system of government. The two Houses have equal voice in all legislative matters, and the Senate has but exercised its legitimate prerogatives.

So let us be practical for a minute. The House seeks the dismissal of these three men. How can that objective be accomplished? Not by defeating this report. That would leave them in office.

If you reject this conference report they retain their jobs undisturbed.

But if you agree to this conference report you adopt a plan under which these

men will be removed from office before the 15th of next November unless appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

You may take your choice. I know the alternative is not exactly to our liking, but we face a situation—do you want to take them out or do you want to leave them in. If you reject this report, you leave them in, and if you agree to it, you adopt the only available method of removing them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, your conferees have brought in here a unanimous report. The items in difference that have not been composed are, as stated to you by the chairman of the committee, amendment numbered 5 and amendments numbered 60 and 61. The amendment numbered 5 relates to the President's emergency fund. The language frankly is a compromise. It will permit the President to use the funds for necessary war activities without enlarging the use of it so much on other things than war activities. I believe we have done the best we could on it. The items that the House put in, the Farm Security and the National Resources Planning Board, have been taken care of by the independent offices appropriation bill and the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

As to amendments 60 and 61, which provide for taking off the pay roll of the United States three men—Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett—the first two are in that agency of the Federal Communications Commission which was classified by the three leaders of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—Admiral Leahy, Admiral King, and General Marshall—in a communication which was in the press yesterday and which was brought before the committee investigating the Federal Communications Commission, as an agency that is a menace to the war effort. It was recommended by them that that agency be dispensed with and that the activity that it was presently performing be turned over to the Military Establishments. If any more proof of the kind of a job that those gentlemen were doing was needed, that would be it.

It is to be regretted that we have not been able to come to an agreement with the Senate that would throw them off the roll immediately. It was apparent from the examination they were given before the Kerr committee—and that represents 385 pages of testimony—that the first loyalty of those men was not to the United States of America, and the committee felt that they should go off the pay roll. I feel that they should go off the pay roll. But we have got to have legislation that the Senate will agree to. After long struggle, after four or five votes in the House and four or five in the Senate, we have come to this situation: They go off the roll unless before the 15th of November their names are sent to the Senate and the Senate confirms them.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. In just a minute. It seems incredible that the President, with the picture that I have presented, with the indictment of the division that those men are active in, by military authorities, would present their names to the Senate for confirmation. It seems incredible that the Senate could confirm them with the situation that is presented. I am confident that they will go off the roll for good on the 15th day of November.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. In just a moment. I feel that it is of the utmost importance that we pass legislation that will ultimately provide for taking them off the roll. Those men have been given a fair hearing. They have been given every opportunity to present their case.

I believe that this conference report should now be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, before we consider the urgent deficiency bill, I think at least one Member of this House ought to rise in opposition to the amendment which concerns three individuals. I do not want it to go down that the Senate was the only body which had concern for our American processes of individual liberty.

Not that I expect this opposition to do much good, but I want the RECORD to show that not everyone in this House sat by slack-jawed and pads clapping in agreement when charges were passed off as truth. There are many of us here who well realize the danger to our traditions in this Kerr amendment.

In the first place, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] rose on a point of personal privilege and in defending himself proceeded to blacken the character of 39 other individuals who had nothing whatever to do with the case. His statements were full of many misstatements. True to the tradition of his committee there had been no hearings, no fairness, no chance for defense. As a matter of fact, there had not even been any prior investigation. Men that he said should be thrown off the Government pay roll were not even on it. One of them had been a paratrooper for 6 months. A simple phone call would have disclosed that.

And since no one, not even the House of Representatives, can take a Dies charge at face value, the House set up an investigating committee to investigate the work of an investigating committee.

In the second place, the Kerr committee completely disregarded precedents—and I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that there is a long list of precedents for procedure for committees like the Kerr committee. Congress has been trying to throw individuals off the Government pay roll since way back in 1787 and there is an established method for procedure in such cases with prosecuting and defense attorneys, with open hearings and open

transcripts of all those hearings and charges made available to the accused, and all that sort of thing. Completely disregarding these precedents of procedure, the Kerr committee made its report after secret meetings and unpublished findings. With this lack of information the House voted. Later, after repeated insistence, the hearings were belatedly published.

But the Senate smelled a slight odor of ancient tombs in which liberty had been buried, and turned the matter down.

And now, in the third place, there has come forth a typical politician's weasel compromise. The matter having become too hot to handle has all been tossed in the lap of the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. And this compromise has been concocted by a House of Representatives which claims it is reasserting its own responsibility.

By its action on these three individuals, the House will certainly not gain in prestige nor in public respect.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, as one who has consistently voted against the so-called Kerr amendment denying certain employees of the executive department their salaries, I want to say that I think the House should approve the report of the conferees. I cannot believe that if these men are unfit to serve their country that the President, in the first place, would appoint them. Neither do I believe that the Senate would confirm such an appointment in the event the President so acted.

As the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has so well said, "the Senate is an integral part of the Congress." Now, in analogous situations, the Senate would have the last say. Suppose that the alleged acts of these men amounted to impeachable offenses, and suppose that their classification were such, which is not a fact, that they could be impeached, it would be the duty of the House of Representatives to present the articles of impeachment to the Senate. Thereafter it would be the duty of the Senate to determine the guilt or innocence of the men so sought to be impeached after full hearing. Therefore, as I have said, in analogous situations the Senate would have the last say. Accordingly, it is my contention that we should not try to force our judgment upon the judgment of the Senate of the United States in this instance, and accordingly I am going to vote for the report of the conferees.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have signed this conference report, and I am going along with it. I am going along with it for several reasons.

I am supporting it, first, because I believe that it offers the only foreseeable possibility of enacting this bill into law

at this time and thereby providing the funds that are essential to many people on the Federal pay rolls and to the various Federal agencies provided for in this urgent deficiency bill.

On four successive occasions the Senate has voted down proposals that have been made for resolving the items in dispute, including almost the identical proposition that is now before us. It was only last evening on the fifth attempt that an affirmative vote was obtained in the Senate for that proposition. The acceptance of this report at this time will dispose of the entire bill.

Secondly, I am supporting the report because, from my standpoint, there has been an improvement in respect to the language affecting the use of the President's emergency fund.

If I were writing the language, I should prefer more restrictive language than that now in the bill. There has been clear indication in both the Senate and the House that the abuse of these funds in the past in the hands of the Bureau of the Budget must cease. The limiting language included in the bill at this time is at least a step in the right direction in that it reflects the determination in this respect of both Houses.

Finally I am supporting the report because it includes, in my judgment, the most satisfactory agreement obtainable in respect to the three Federal employees whom the Kerr committee and the House as a whole have determined should be eliminated from the Federal pay roll.

A concession is, of course, involved insofar as the House is concerned. On the other hand, if accepted, the agreement specifically provides that all three employees in question shall definitely go off the Federal pay roll on November 15 unless there is first a reappointment by the President of the United States; and second, confirmation of any reappointment by the Senate of the United States.

In other words, the burden is placed squarely on the shoulders of the President and on the shoulders of the other body. In the absence of affirmative action by both, all three employees will go off the pay rolls on November 15. In a sense the House indicts and the Senate tries.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. Suppose they are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Would that put them in an unimpeachable class?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am not sure that I understand the gentleman's question. I agree with the gentleman from New York in the light of the testimony developed by the Kerr committee that it is highly improbable that reappointment and confirmation of the three employees in question could take place. If it should take place surely the House is entirely free, surely any Member of the House is entirely free to take any appropriate action either collectively or individually.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. This is true, is it not, that if these men were to be impeached the House would present the articles of impeachment, which would have to be filed with the Senate, and then the Senate would decide the guilt or innocence of these individuals?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman is correct. The proposal before us is somewhat analogous to that.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, would it not be fair to assume that if these gentlemen are subject to impeachment by the House and trial by the Senate that the House and the other body should proceed now with the impeachment, rather than go through this delay to November 15?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Of course, there is no impeachment here. Nothing is involved except fitness to remain on the Federal pay rolls. Postponement to November 15 will certainly provide more than ample opportunity for the other body to consider the 380 pages of evidence of the Kerr committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, if this situation is understood by the House I do not believe that we will have very many votes against the conference report. After all, we are a conference committee delegated to fight for what the House adopts, and to try to do the best we can where there is a disagreement. We cannot force the Senate to do what we say, no matter how much we may want them to do it and no matter how strong we are for what we want them to do. They are a sovereign body and they do not have to do what we wish. And in the same way the reverse is true.

We have now come to a situation where the conferees have fought vigorously because of the attitude of this House, and the Senate has voted four times "no," and one time for that which we are now presenting to you. The situation stands now that the Senate declines to do exactly what the House wishes it to do.

I think there is an old line of precedents that the body which proposes a new proposition, such as this, must yield. When both sides find themselves irreconcilably in disagreement, there is certainly the precedent that the House which proposes the change is the one that must recede. In other words, as we are now in such a situation and the Senate has stood pat, there would not be anything left according to precedent but for the House to recede. If we do not choose to do that, the result is the same, because the bill cannot pass and therefore we get nothing out of it at all as to this amendment. Under those conditions, therefore, we bring back to the

House something that is very fair and very sensible, it seems to me. The two things in controversy are, first, that if any funds are denied in an appropriation for any specific purpose the President cannot use emergency funds for that purpose. That is an agreement between us and it seems to me there should be no question about that.

As far as these three men are concerned, we are in this situation under the proposed agreement of the conference: That these men go off the pay roll in accordance with the wishes of the House, on November 15, unless their names are certified to the Senate and the Senate confirms those names. That is fair to the Senate; that gives the Senate a chance to go into the matter, to determine for themselves whether they have had a fair trial; and that is what they have objected to, that the Senators have had no opportunity to weigh the testimony. In an impeachment proceeding, of course, the indictment is filed by the House and those impeached are tried by the Senate. This proceeding is very similar.

If you will examine the bill you will see there are many agencies here that are affected by this bill. It covers such items as salaries of pages, clerks, and Government employees; \$122,000,000 of that kind of pay is being held up at this time. There is no use of our being hard-headed and saying that the Senate must do what we say. After all, the Senate does not have to follow our recommendation; but there are others involved; these men and women who are being denied their pay because of the fact that we have not acted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As a matter of fact, if the conference report is adopted, if these men are nominated and confirmed by the Senate before November 15, they are changed in their classification from inferior officials, are they not? In other words, under those conditions, their position is changed so they could be removed only by impeachment. They have an entirely different status.

Mr. O'NEAL. I think under the circumstances of the disagreement we must consider the fact that we are confronted with a situation where we are punishing Government employees who are being denied money that they need, and need very badly, and that their just pay is being held up because of the delay in passing this bill. We should pass the conference report unanimously.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have always supported the Dies committee and supported the report of the Kerr committee. The Senate action is perfectly indefensible even according to their own standards, for when one of their number opposes a nominee for personal reasons and without evidence he goes out. That is perfectly inconsistent

with the Senate's action on the men here who have been investigated. Too, some one erred in not getting the Kerr committee report to the Senate Members earlier.

But, regardless of that, as I have watched the proceedings of these conferences I am convinced that this is the best we can do. If anybody had watched the Senate yesterday, watched the Senator from Tennessee trying to defend this conference report from all the assaults that were made on it, they would have wondered how he ever got it through. I think therefore we should accept this as the very best proposition possible for an agreement.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of confidence in the conferees on this bill. I also appreciate that a great many Members here are anxious to get home on the recess, but there is a principle involved here that goes deeper than just the fate of these three men. The principle involved here is whether or not people whose ideology is inimical to our republican form of government should be retained on the Federal pay roll. This is a fundamental principle of Americanism and we cannot get away from it. I followed the record of these men for years before I was ever a Member of Congress and I want to say that, knowing their records as I do, I would rather stay here all summer than relinquish my position in voting these men off the pay roll. Here and now if we adopt this conference report we are going to find that these three men—Dodd, Watson, and Lovett—will resign before November 15, and then where are you? I care not what position any Member of this House may take, but as for myself I cannot vote for the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen from Florida and other gentlemen who are opening fire on the adoption of this conference report are experienced and wise legislators. They know that in many, many instances—in fact in most instances—legislation is a matter of compromise. Somewhere along the line there must be a meeting of minds. They know that when the zero hour arrives at the end of a fiscal year, with appropriation measures in a bad log jam, a give-and-take process of compromise must necessarily be invoked or vital appropriations for the ensuing fiscal year would fail, resulting in indescribable confusion and distress.

Such a situation has now arisen. It is a condition and not a theory that confronts us. The zero hour in respect to this important appropriation bill is now at hand. The end of the current fiscal year has come and we are floundering in uncertainty. The sensible thing to do, the reasonable thing for reasonable men

and women to do, is to agree to this conference report and allow this bill to become a law.

If it does not become a law, what will be the result? A great number of Government employees, both in Washington and in the field, will continue to be without their salaries, and in these days when high costs have forced hand-to-mouth living, thousands upon thousands of these Government workers will find themselves financially embarrassed immediately. The bill carries \$122,000,000 to pay the salaries of these employees. Surely we should do all we can to save these faithful Government workers from this inconvenience and suffering. Included in the total who would be affected are the District of Columbia school teachers.

The bill carries \$609,000 for the training of nurses for the United States Public Health Service, and that important activity will be paralyzed unless the bill passes. It carries \$2,000,000 for custodial employees of Government buildings, all over the country, in your district and mine, who are paid meagerly at the best and who will suffer intensely if their pay is denied. It carries the money for the Bituminous Coal Act, a vital activity. It is the bill that provides the money to loan to soldiers while they are being rehabilitated, and if those loans are stopped or interfered with for any appreciable time there undoubtedly will be deep resentment. If this bill does not pass, the President will have no emergency fund—no fund he can draw upon to meet any desperately emergent situation that might unexpectedly arise. That is an unthinkable situation in the midst of a great war.

Now let us pause for a moment to analyze the proposal before us and see if it is not a reasonable basis of agreement. It is true that the three gentlemen whom the House thought should be dismissed immediately from the Government rolls, Messrs. Watson, Dodd, and Lovett, will not be dismissed immediately but will be given a lease of life until November 15 next. If by that time the President has not reappointed them and the Senate has not confirmed them they will go off of the rolls automatically. What, after all, is unreasonable about that proposition? What danger to the public interest could possibly be involved in carrying out this proposal? It should be remembered that these three men have never been found guilty of subversive activity. What the House found them guilty of was anti-American indoctrination and not subversive activity. The difference between the two is as wide as the Gulf of Mexico. What Judge KERR's able committee, in which we all have complete confidence, said to these men was:

We don't like your philosophy and we don't believe that men of your type of thinking should be in the public service of the United States.

That was all. And to that the House agreed. And we who approve this conference report point out that before these men can remain on the pay roll it will be necessary for them under this conference agreement to jump two big

hurdles. No one knows whether they can jump either hurdle. The first hurdle is reappointment by the President. The second hurdle is confirmation by the Senate. As strongly as I approve the judgment of the House in the original instance, I am not averse to having the cases of these three men reviewed by the President and the Senate. We of the House have been busy men and our consideration of the cases has necessarily been of limited duration and extent. We believe that further review by the President and the Senate is unnecessary to establish the unsuitability of these persons for Government service but to my way of thinking it is in the interest of a liberality of justice and fair play that such a further review be allowed. I do not expect it to change the result one particle. The three accused are men of high intelligence and I do not think for a moment that anyone even imagines that they will engage or attempt to engage in any subversive activities between now and November 15. If they should do so the F. B. I. would catch up with them. The F. B. I. acts when action is required and it is not bound by any 4½ months' deferment agreement.

No one disapproves more heartily than I do the McKellar bill requiring Senate confirmation of an army of Government employees and I will never vote for it. But the proposition before us is not the McKellar bill. It is a specific proposal for a specific purpose, which is to break the appropriations log jam with which we are presently confronted, to give the departmental workers the pay to which they are entitled and to permit the Government to function. I appeal to you as sensible men and women to adopt this conference agreement both because it is a reasonable agreement and because it is the only way out of a very serious dilemma.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for being so kind as to give me 4 minutes when there are so many Members who wish time on this motion.

We have an amazing situation here this afternoon. I believe I can properly say that many Members stood here in this well and told you they believed that these men should be fired; and they said it had been determined definitely that they were not loyal to the United States, but still they asked us to enter into a compromise. You cannot compromise the flag of the United States.

As far as the Senate's being a part of this Congress is concerned, I have known that for a very long time, from the time I was in grammar school; but the House is also a part of this Congress. Why should we knuckle to the Senate just because they will not accept what we have given to them? They have been very arbitrary and inconsistent from the beginning. In the first place when this amendment came to them they voted unanimously to reject it. In the second place, when we sent this compromise back to them they voted again to reject it, but we gained votes. So they

were willing to go a little further. Finally, they have accepted this compromise, which is very inconsistent, because in first rejecting this amendment they told us we should not interfere with an executive department of the Government. Then they turned right around and accepted a proposition giving them the right to confirm these men, which is interfering.

As I see it, there is no reason why these men should be appointed by the President; there is no reason why the Senate should confirm them, and there is no reason why any Member speaking of this compromise should tell us that this means if we do not accept this compromise that we will not have a bill. Yes; we do need a vacation; I need one just as much as anybody, but I am willing to stay here until Christmas Day to get these men out. Every one of us knows that the Dies committee and the Kerr committee have investigated these men and have determined that they are subversive. When these men stand here and admit they are not loyal to the United States there is no reason why we should accept any compromise and keep these men on the pay roll.

I want to say just one other thing. It has just come to me from a Member on the Republican side that some of the Republicans think it is very smart to adopt this compromise and put the whole thing in the lap of the President. You are playing politics with something dangerous if you vote that way. You Democrats are playing politics if you back them up.

We have voted twice on this measure. On the first occasion we voted to expel these men 318 to 62, and on the second occasion 301 to 71. The Senate has voted the third time and has finally accepted this compromise. I believe if we send it back again they will accept the amendment.

I say again I am not willing to compromise. We should send this back, and we will get a bill passed if we are willing to stay here long enough to get rid of these subversive influences in the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as one who disagreed with the findings of the Kerr committee, I believe we should adopt this compromise because a half loaf is better than no loaf at all. I disagreed with the findings of that committee with reference to these three men because I felt that they were determined to be guilty by mere association and that the proceedings were not legal or judicial and were violative of the Constitution which precludes bills of attainder.

I believe the compromise should be adopted. I said half a loaf is better than no loaf at all, although I am somewhat of the opinion that this is not even half a loaf. These men—Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett—in a way have been "lynched." On straight principle, no one should vote for this compromise. But we

have to be pragmatic. The deficiency appropriation bill which we are presently considering must pass. Otherwise, the salaries of thousands of thousands of persons will be held up. Appropriations for various departments will be prevented. Those departments cannot function. We must be practical.

The Constitution precludes a bill of attainder either by the Federal or the State Government.

We brought charges against these three men; we tried these three men; we punished these three men. That is not a judicial method of trial. It is a star-chamber proceeding. No legislator can exercise the offices of prosecutor, judge, jury, and sheriff at the same time.

We thereby disregard all the safeguards of a fair trial.

In cases of impeachment the lower House acts as prosecutor and the Senate acts as judge. There is a sharp demarcation between the one who brings the charges and the one who hears the charges.

The proceedings against these three men are illegal; otherwise we could just as well attempt to oust the President or the Vice President or a member of the Cabinet by just cutting off his salary.

Time will not permit going into the details of the charges against these men. The gravamen of one of the charges is that because they were associated and/or indirectly, or directly, connected with subversive or communistic organizations, they are, in turn, communistic or subversives. In other words, they were made guilty by association. That is a new method of trial and judgment. Wendell Willkie recently represented a Communist in the Supreme Court. Did that representation make him a Communist? Daniel Webster acted as attorney for many criminals. Did that make him a criminal? Former Chief Justice Hughes represented, in his New York office when he was a lawyer, many corporate malefactors guilty of violation of the anti-trust laws? Did that make him an offender? An eminent colonel was assigned to represent the Nazi saboteurs recently in Washington before the Supreme Court. Did that make of him a saboteur or a Nazi?

Frequently Members of the House and Senate are called upon to address gatherings or to write for certain publications. Busy as they are, they are unable at times to investigate thoroughly the make-up and the nature of these groups. Sometimes they are sucked in innocently. They find out, after the event, that they have addressed a group or written for a publication that may have been maintained by some Fascist and/or communistic elements. Is the Senator or Congressman thus innocently siphoned into an unfortunate situation to be called Fascist or Communist?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the opposition in the other body to the language that we placed in this bill is on the ground that it is unconstitutional for us

to do what we did. Now we find the Senate says that while it is unconstitutional to take these radicals off the pay roll today, on the 15th of November doing the selfsame thing will be constitutional.

As to the charges that they have not had a day in court, may I say that I am the last person in the world who would deprive any citizen of his day in court, but it certainly seems to me that these people are not entitled to a trial in every tribunal of the land. We have confidence in the Kerr committee. I do not think a more careful committee could have been selected, and I am perfectly willing to follow the recommendation of that committee.

I want to say a word to the Democrats, but I do not want the Members on the left side of the aisle to listen to what I have to say. I have become so all-fired mad at being compelled to apologize for people on the public pay roll who are masquerading as Democrats that it seems to me this is the time to show the people who are responsible for these employees that we do not want to be embarrassed any longer. If you took this whole crowd of starry-eyed political nonentities and placed them in the most sparsely settled county in the United States, their combined influence would not be sufficient to elect anyone dog-catcher.

Why do we who have fought year in and year out for the principles of Thomas Jefferson have to adopt this group who stand for nothing except their own selfish ends? It is time that we eliminate the greatest liability our great party has to contend with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who voted against the amendment to strike these men from the pay roll when it was first presented and I have voted that way all along. I had hoped that the House conferees might agree to the original Senate position. Of course, we must get legislation passed eventually and I realize that possibly something has to be worked out to meet the position on both sides of the Capitol.

My fear about this compromise is, and I am inclined to vote against it on this theory, that the Senate has passed a bill requiring Senate confirmation of all employees who earn more than \$4,500 per year. An amendment to that effect has been placed on two appropriation bills when they come back from the Senate. I fear that by agreeing to this compromise we will be impliedly recognizing that all employees of the Federal Government who earn a substantial amount should be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. I hope that the chairman of the committee in the time remaining to the committee will state whether or not this is any implied recognition of that principle because if it is I think it would be a very dangerous vote on the part of the House to agree to this compromise. I believe the Senate confirmation bill is bad legislation and not in the public interest.

Unless that matter is cleared up by the chairman of the committee and we have a legislative expression that we are not recognizing Senate confirmation I shall be forced to vote against the compromise.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I have consistently opposed the Kerr amendment. I feel this compromise brings no honor to either the Senate or the House. To vote for this compromise is to vote that these men be discharged from the pay roll on November 15 instead of June 30. The date does not make any difference; whether or not these people hold a job for 5 more months does not make any difference; what does make a difference is that to discharge them from the pay roll violates every principle of elementary democracy; it is an unconstitutional act, and it has the earmarks of fascism. Further, this so-called compromise is an invasion of the power of the Executive to appoint. I therefore oppose the compromise for the same reasons I have opposed the discharge of these three employees.

Mr. KEFAUVER. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if this will be impliedly recognizing that all employees of the Federal Government earning substantial amounts shall be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, that is, by the adoption of this conference report. If this is getting a foot in the door I shall have to vote against the conference report.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It has no relation whatever to that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein certain quotations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I want to say this to this House as earnestly as I can: As a member of the Kerr committee, who has served long and earnestly on that committee and done his level best, I plead with you to accept this conference report. I assure you that as far as I am concerned this is no compromise of principle. The basis upon which the Kerr committee was set up was that we would go through the evidence and recommend those people whom we thought to be unfit for public service. We have done that in these three cases. I am entirely willing to believe that when Members of this House and of the Kerr committee go before the proper Senate committees they will be able to convince those committees that these men are

still unfit for public service. I have not lost faith in representative government, either in the House or in the Senate.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. In just a minute.

Let me say that I have taken the time to go to the office of the Kerr committee and review every case that is in its files. If some of you would spend that much time in such unpleasant work you would understand why I am so keenly interested in this.

I think that while it is true that there are men who need to be condemned, there are also men who need to be exonerated. It is just as important that a free and responsive government should try to provide justice and free the innocent as that it should seek to convict the guilty.

There is on the Dies list one man, Thomas Arthur Bisson, whose only crime is that he lived much of his lifetime as a missionary for the Methodist Church in China. When that man came back to this country, when the invasion of China made it impossible for him to remain there in his work, he went to a rally promoted by the Friends of China and made an eloquent plea for the people he had been serving. His name got tangled up with the organization and he is today on a blacklist. I say to you he does not belong there.

One of the editors of Time magazine has written your committee and made the strongest possible plea in behalf of this individual. I want to clear him by the same sort of legislative process we have been working on, and which this conference report would continue.

On that list there is a young man, David Karr, whose only crime is that he wrote a series of newspaper articles exposing the establishment of a German-American Bund in New York City. Somehow those articles were too hot for the New York press to publish, and they got into the hands of one of his friends, and, innocently, they were taken down to the Daily Worker and printed there at that time. The young man received no pay for his work. He did not know his articles were going to be printed in the Daily Worker. Today he is criticized because he at that early time, 4 years ago, condemned and exposed the German-American Bund. Was he wrong? Should his case not be heard and settled as we are here proposing?

In addition, there is a young man—and his name is Joseph Facci; the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] knows him—whose only crime is that he was an anti-Mussolini Italian in California. He opposed Mussolini all the way through. For that he became listed with anti-Fascist groups whose purposes were not of the best.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I decline to yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from New Mexico, instead of talking about these three who have been convicted, is talking about some who are

not involved in this amendment. I should like to have him discuss the cases before.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico will proceed in order.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. When I see three names of that nature that I know should be cleared, I say to you that I want this Congress to establish a policy that can carry on and that will permit our committee to work. We have condemned three men. I think we have condemned them properly, but I do not think the job has been done in this Government.

There was a man, Karl Borders, who was head of the rent section of O. P. A., whose record as far as public life is concerned was that he belonged to and was secretary of a certain League of Industrial Democracy in Chicago, an organization working for "a social order based on production for use and not for profit." He worked in Soviet Russia for several years. That individual became head of the rent control division of O. P. A. He is today the head of the O. P. A. in Hawaii at \$8,000 per year. Is it any wonder that we have had some trouble on the profit situation within O. P. A.? Is it any wonder that there have been complaints on the rent section of O. P. A.?

Let me point out to you that a few days ago there was a controversy over a certain Negro, Dorey Wilkerson, who resigned from O. P. A. to go out and spend his life as a Communist lecturer. It was asserted that people in O. P. A. were surprised that he had become a Communist lecturer and that no one had any idea of his Communist leanings. They should not have been surprised because the Department of Justice on May 15, 1943, over the signature of John Edgar Hoover sent to his employers a reminder that in February of 1942 the F. B. I. had established the fact that he was a Communist, and in their memorandum of May 15 they said, "He is now reported getting ready to become a Communist lecturer."

Here is what the F. B. I. said about him:

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., May 15, 1943.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE INTERDEPARTMENTAL
COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYEE INVESTIGATIONS

Under date of May 21, 1942, I made available to Mr. Edwin D. Dickinson, formerly Special Assistant to the Attorney General, a copy of the report of Special Agent G. W. Hall, dated March 7, 1942, at Washington, D. C., which reflected this Bureau's investigation of Dorey Alphonso Wilkerson, an employee of the Federal Security Agency, conducted under the provisions of Public Law No. 135, Seventy-seventh Congress.

As will be observed from a review of that report, considerable information was reported showing Wilkerson's activities with various organizations heretofore declared subversive by the Department of Justice with respect to these types of cases. As further shown, one confidential source related that Wilkerson was a member of the Communist Party and worked directly out of the national office in New York City. This person stated, however, that Wilkerson did not belong to the Communist Party in the District of Columbia in an effort to hide his party connections.

The results of this investigation were made available to the Federal Security Agency on

March 26, 1942, and that agency advised by letter, dated December 9, 1942, that "we find nothing to show that the above employee has engaged in activities which might properly be characterized as subversive or disloyal to our Government. Therefore, he has been exonerated, and we are filing the report without further action."

In this regard and as of possible interest to the committee the Washington field office of this Bureau recently received information from a highly confidential source that Doxey Wilkerson contemplates resigning his position with the Federal Security Agency in order that he might devote his full time to Communist Party work in Baltimore, Md.

Very truly yours,

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER,
Director.

Think of that. The report of the F. B. I. as early as March 7, 1942, had indicated the nature of Wilkerson's beliefs. The memorandum had listed directly the Communist Party, which the Attorney General of the United States found to be subversive, and six other organizations which he had classified as fronts for subversive movements.

What do you suppose the agency affected did about that? Why, it cleared Wilkerson, of course. On December 9, 1942, the Assistant Administrator ruled:

We find nothing to show that the above employee has engaged in activities which might properly be characterized as subversive or disloyal to our Government. Therefore, he has been exonerated, and we are filing the report without further action.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation was so notified.

That was a strange action, for on July 9, 1942, the special investigation of the Wilkerson case had caused a letter to be sent to the subversive personnel committee of the agency which read:

The majority of confidential informants advised that Wilkerson consistently follows the Communist party line and if he is not a member of the party is at least a fellow traveler. He was president of the American Federation of Teachers when the Communists were in control.

That is not a report of the Dies committee or the Kerr committee. That is from Wilkerson's own agency. And the report closed with these highly important observations:

Confidential informant T-34 advised that Wilkerson is a member of the Communist Party working out of the national office on the Communist Party in New York. Other informants stated that they observed Wilkerson at a Communist meeting in the Press Building on September 21, 1941. He seems to be closely tied up with Communist activity in the District of Columbia.

What do you suppose happened then? Exactly nothing. Wilkerson was invited in for a hearing within his Department and allowed to lecture on the beauties of socialism and the advantages of life in a Communist state, and that was all.

But you can observe from the letter of the F. B. I. on May 15, 1943, that it was not satisfied. J. Edgar Hoover was still after Professor Wilkerson. He told the Department again that Wilkerson was about to resign to devote his full time to Communist Party work. That was serious, and the head of the F. B. I. had a right to expect that the agency would act.

What happened? The matter was routed around the office and on June 19, only a few days before he actually resigned to work for the Communists, he was again cleared with this report:

Our committee of course could not establish conclusively that Wilkerson was not subversive—it is impossible to establish that conclusively about anyone. But the evidence available to the committee was not such as to show he was subversive or disloyal.

That gives us a complete and clear index to the workings of the interdepartmental committee and the special white-washing committees set up within the departments. They have made a farce of the entire proceedings and their verdicts cannot be trusted. Evidence? Why, they had it by the barrel. If time permitted, I could read it to you by the running yard, but it should be enough to let the official warning of the F. B. I. stand, particularly when Wilkerson proved the accuracy of the F. B. I. charges by doing exactly what J. Edgar Hoover said he was planning to do.

Very well, but what of the United States Civil Service Commission which is supposed to screen these applicants for public positions. I wondered how carefully it had acted.

Let me give you its report on the Wilkerson case as it came to me a day or two ago:

UNITED STATES CIVIL
SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., July 1, 1943.

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: You requested for use as a member of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations a report from the Commission on the case of Mr. Doxey A. Wilkerson. Mr. Wilkerson recently resigned from employment with the Office of Price Administration.

The records of the Commission show that Mr. Wilkerson was approved for appointment in a temporary position in the Consumers' Division, Office of Price Administration, on June 29, 1942. This employment was on a per diem basis, the title of the position being "Consultant." The authority used for appointment was a provision designated as paragraph 13 of section 1 of schedule A of Civil Service Rules. Appointments under this provision are excepted from examination and are not regarded as being in the regular civil service. The provision is for the purpose of enabling Government agencies to make temporary, part time, or intermittent appointment of professional, scientific, or technical experts for consultation purposes. Investigations are not made for appointments under this authority unless requested by the employing agency.

Mr. Wilkerson's temporary appointment, effected as above, was extended on the following dates: July 9, 1942, August 21, 1942, September 21, 1942, and November 9, 1942.

On March 27, 1943, the Civil Service Commission approved Mr. Wilkerson's appointment as an Education Specialist at a salary of \$3,800 per annum in the Office of Price Administration. This appointment was authorized for what is known as war-service employment. It does not confer civil-service status but authorizes employment for the duration of the war and not to exceed 6 months thereafter. The appointment approved on March 27, 1943, was made subject to investigation. Under agreement between the Civil Service Commission and the Office for Emergency Management responsibility for character investigation for appointees of constituent agencies of the Office for Emer-

gency Management is for the central administrative services of the Office for Emergency Management. The Civil Service Commission passes on reports of such investigations when received. No such report has been received on the Wilkerson case.

It is understood that you are interested in a report on the case of Mr. Karl Borders and that a written request for this report will be forwarded to the Commission either by yourself or through the office of Congressman KERR, chairman of the subcommittee. The Commission has an investigation report on the Borders case and the information is being put in shape for forwarding.

By direction of the Commission:

Very respectfully,

WILLIAM C. HULL,
Executive Assistant.

I say if the departments will not do the job of checking these people, it is necessary for some committee to work, and if you do not adopt this compromise you are going to find out that the Kerr committee cannot work and no other committee of Congress can work.

I congratulate the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and their colleagues on the deficiency committee who have stood up and fought hard for what the Kerr committee tried to do. They have done their best to get this matter the way that you wanted it, but they could not, and they had to take something that I think is satisfactory because I am convinced that when the record of these men is made plain to the Senate you are not going to have any trouble with the situation there. What changed the recent votes on this matter in the Senate? The fact that the Kerr committee hearings were published and the Senators could read them. That same thing will happen again.

MR. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

MR. DIRKSEN. Is it not true that the language of the report which was signed by the gentleman from New Mexico states that they are unfit to continue in Federal employ?

MR. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes; and I think they are unfit. I want to get them off as quickly as I can, and as nearly as I can see it, the first day is the 15th of November. So adopt the conference report and make that possible.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

MR. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

MR. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] addressed himself a moment ago to the Democrats. He assumed a rather apologetic vein. I am going to address myself to the Republicans. I say the Republican Party need not make any apology for its opposition to any third-party movement. I want to call a witness or two to the stand right now. I ask my Republican brethren whether the Americanism of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] could ever be

questioned. I ask my Republican brethren whether the Americanism of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGLESWORTH] could ever be questioned. I ask my Republican brethren whether the Americanism of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] could ever be questioned. I shall make no profession as to my own position. I supported, as did my three colleagues on this committee, the Kerr committee. We have urged that the evidence be brought in, which we think was sufficient upon which to base the findings that have been made. We in no way repudiate the action of that committee. We in no way condone the conduct of these three men. However, we have reached a very practical problem. My friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]—and there is no man in the House for whom I have a greater regard or warmer affection—asks whether the findings were not that those men should not continue in public service. We still say so. We have not changed our opinion on that.

We have gotten to the point, however, where we must face the practical problem as to the best way to get rid of them. Oh, the easy thing to say is that we will wait until next Christmas if necessary to get rid of these men. That is not the answer to this problem. The question is whether—when controversies present themselves, and reasonable men, honest men, find that there are differences of opinion, something in the nature of irreconcilable differences of opinion—whether each side is willing to give some ground in order to reach a workable conclusion. I wonder whether the constitutional convention would have brought forth the document which it did, had there not been men in that body who realized that compromise must be reached.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I believe the constitutional convention was a convention of great compromises—not the compromising of principle but the compromising of means by which principle might be sustained. I am now addressing my Republican friends, just as my friend addressed the Democrats. I am pleading to the Republicans. The four Republicans who sat on this conference committee were just as positive in their denunciation of those agencies that have been dangerous to the way of American life and our constitutional government as any man in the House. We are just as much opposed to these men as you are. We are not condoning their conduct. We are asking you, however, to have faith in us. We have used the best means we have at our command for carrying out the work of the Kerr committee and the findings of that body. We plead for your endorsement and approval.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution forbids the passing by Congress of any legislation that inflicts punishment without judicial trial. Legislative inquisitions, no matter how fair, honest, and able the committees that conduct them, are not judicial trials. Neither is confirmation by the Senate, nor its refusal to confirm. Nothing but a trial in a court of law satisfies the mandate of the Constitution.

The Congress has no more right to remove Watson, Dodd, and Lovett from office in November than now.

The granting to the sentenced trio of the possibility of another hearing before a Senate committee falls just as short of giving them a trial in court as did the hearings held by the Dies and Kerr committees of the House. Nor would it be a judicial trial if an inquisition before a Senate committee, or even before the Senate itself, were certain. No hearing, investigation, or trial which could be conducted by the Congress, or either House thereof, nor any part of either, could possibly be a judicial trial. Any such procedure would, of course, be legislative action—not judicial. The Constitution says:

The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish.

No possible procedure in either of the other two coordinate branches of our Government can be a judicial procedure. It may be, and frequently is, a perfectly judicious procedure, but none can be judicial unless conducted in that branch of our Government in which all judicial power of the United States is vested. Therefore, multiplying the number of nonjudicial trials is as absurd as trying to make three—or a dozen—wrongs constitute a right.

In the second place, the Congress has no more constitutional power to invade the province of the Executive authority by requiring the Chief Executive to submit the appointments of certain named employees in the executive branch of our Government to the Senate for confirmation, *vel non*—the right to appoint whom was vested by act of Congress in subordinate officials of the executive branch—than it has to remove them from office by more direct legislative action.

So, neither postponing the date of execution nor the grant of the possibility of another nonjudicial trial adds any color or semblance of constitutionality to this latest proposal. Nor is the invasion of the province of the Executive power cured by attempting to force the Chief Executive to submit these names for the advice and consent of the Senate.

May I again call your attention to some of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States that support these contentions? Here they are: *Cummings v. Missouri* (71 U. S. (4 Wall. 277); *Ex parte Garland* (71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 333); *Myers v. U. S.* (272 U. S. 52); *U. S. v. Perkins* (116 U. S. 483); *Hum-*

phrey's Executor v. U. S. (295 U. S. 602); *Morgan v. T. V. A.* (115 Fed. (2d) 990), in which certiorari was denied in 61 Supreme Court Report 806.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I hope very much that the House will adopt this conference report. I think it has been shown here that every member of this conference committee has supported and is supporting the Kerr committee. Every member of this conference feels just as keenly about the merits and the importance of the Kerr amendment as any Member of this House can feel. But, after all, it is a condition and not a theory that we are confronted with. I would like for just a minute, if you will bear with me, to review the history of this thing. Let me say, if I may be pardoned for being a little personal, that the first amendment ever written into any Federal law, seeking to keep Communists off the pay roll or take them off, was an amendment of which I was the author, and was put into the W. P. A. bill which our investigating committee reported to this House. That is how I feel about it; how strongly I feel about it.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have not much time.

Mr. HOBBS. That was the abolition of an entire project or class; was it not?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That was an amendment that provided that nobody could draw pay unless he signed a statement saying that he was not a Communist. It was a sweeping amendment, and it did clean off a lot of people from the rolls.

Let us go back a moment and see where we are. When we first came in at the beginning of this session and started to have amendments put on appropriation bills taking off the Federal pay roll certain individuals because charges had been preferred against them by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], what did the membership of the House say about it? You remember what we said? We said, "That is all right. If they are unfit to serve, let us take them off, but we want some evidence of that. These men are entitled to a day in court. Let us have an orderly procedure, bring us an orderly record, and then we will vote on it." I think that was a tenable position, and we set up the Kerr committee, composed of splendid gentlemen, men of fine attainment who have worked honestly and sincerely and brought in a report on which practically all of us agree.

We voted them off the pay roll. Now, let us try to be fair and let us examine our own position a little. We could not take this action just by a simple resolution of the House of Representatives. It must be concurred in by the Senate of the United States. I do not think we can express so much amazement that a United States Senator said just

what you and I said. What did we do? We carried this bill to the Senate. We said "Senator, here are three men. We have looked into it and they are unfit for service. Will you please sign on the dotted line and turn them out?" "Well," the Senator said, "gentlemen, that is very interesting. Who are they?" "Here are their names. We have looked into it. Do not worry about it. They are unfit for service. The Kerr committee looked into it." The Senator said, "Well, maybe they did, but I do not know anything about it and before I put my name on the dotted line to take a man off the pay roll because he is unfit for public service I want to know what I am doing."

Now, if we want to be fair, that is not an entirely reasonable position. The first time the Senate voted on that, 60 to 0, that is the way it stood. They did not have a line of evidence, not the scratch of a pen in any shape or form except that the House had taken this action, and the Senate was called upon to concur.

Now, what happened? We were able to get that evidence into the hands of a few Senators, and they examined it, and almost without exception they concurred in the action of the House. I do not have the remotest fear that as to these three men mentioned in this report, when the Senate has the facts—and it should be our purpose to give them the facts between now and November 15—they will be just as much interested in taking unfit people off the Federal pay roll as you and I and the House of Representatives.

We certainly have no right to assume that we have a corner on all the patriotism or the zeal for cleaning up the public service at this end of the Capitol. We did put quite a problem on the doorstep of the gentlemen of the Senate when we asked them to accept our action without any examination whatsoever. Now, if the House adopts this conference report, then two things must happen if these men stay on the public pay roll. The President has to send their names to Congress. I cannot possibly think he would do that, but sometimes things have happened that I did not think could happen. But if it did happen, I am confident that when this House and the Kerr committee and those of us who are interested lay the facts, as we have them in the records, on the desks of the Senators involved, the confirmation of these gentlemen will never come about. If that comes about, then we will have carried into execution the judgment of the Kerr committee.

Now, what is the other alternative? Vote down this conference report. If you do, where are you? These gentlemen stay on the pay roll.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield. Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Does the Kerr committee report suggest what should be done with these men?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes, sir; take them off the pay roll.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. The report itself recommends that?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Take them off the pay roll. That is what we all want to see done. That is what ought to be done. If it is not done here, I think every Member of this House ought to stand fast until it is done. I believe it will be done.

Now, if we turn down the conference report, those gentlemen stay on the pay roll. The conferees will have to go back. The deficiency subcommittee will have to reintroduce a bill for all of these department deficiencies and bring it in without the Kerr amendment and get it passed in a week or 10 days, and then all the work of the Kerr committee is gone. You have to start all over again.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I wish to make my position clear. I am opposed to removing these men from the pay roll, and I believe the date when they go off the pay roll makes no difference. Therefore, I shall oppose this so-called compromise.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I understand the gentleman's position.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I think in the interest of good government this is the most wholesome thing the Congress can do.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do not yield for that purpose, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question.

Mr. HENDRICKS. A privileged motion, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. A motion to recommit is not in order, because the Senate has already acted upon the conference report.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Twenty-eight Members have arisen; not a sufficient number.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred eighty-four Members are present, a quorum.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 61: On page 49, line 10, strike out "305" and insert "304."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 61, and agree to the same with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed, insert 306, and after section 304 of the bill, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 305. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations in this act in whole or in part for the fiscal year 1944 shall be available from and including July 1, 1943, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1943, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms hereof."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is made necessary by the fact that we were unable to pass the bill in time to make the 1944 funds in the bill available on the 1st day of the fiscal year. This amendment merely makes the 1944 money retroactive to the 1st day of the fiscal year.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR AGENCIES IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2968) "making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, and 29.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22, 26, 30, and 31; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$155,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Omit the matter inserted by said amendment, and restore the matter stricken out by said

amendment, amended to read as follows: "sum not less than \$56,000,000 shall be allocated for direct obligations of local war price and rationing boards; sums under such appropriation of \$155,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be directly or indirectly used for the payment of the salary or expenses of any person who directs the formulation of any price policy, maximum price, or price ceiling with respect to any article or commodity unless, in the judgment of the Administrator, such persons shall be qualified by experience in business, industry or commerce; but this limitation shall not apply to the Administrator or Acting Administrator as the case may be, in considering, adopting, signing, and promulgating price policies, maximum prices, or price ceilings formulated and prepared in compliance herewith"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$30,735,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$14,091,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$33,222,504"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$24,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "and not more than \$2,750,000 shall be allocated to the Domestic Operations Branch for the following functions only: Office of the Director, including book and magazine coordination sections; Office of Program Coordination; News Bureau; Bureau of Special Services; Radio Bureau; Motion Picture Bureau, not exceeding \$50,000; and for accumulated leave of eliminated employees, for liquidation of organization units herewith reduced or discontinued, and for carrying out partly completed contracts made in organization units herewith reduced or eliminated, not exceeding "\$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 4 of said amendment before the word "within" insert the words "to the public"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$89,267,720"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$203,720"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 11, 24, 25, 32, 33, and 34.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMETT O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,

Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 1: The Senate amendment provides that section 3741 of the Revised Statutes need not be applicable to operations of the Board of Economic Warfare outside continental United States. The Senate recedes.

Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, relating to the Office of Price Administration: Appropriates \$155,000,000, instead of \$130,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$177,335,000 as proposed by the Senate; provides that not less than \$56,000,000, instead of \$59,551,042 as proposed by the House, shall be set apart exclusively for direct obligations of local war-price and rationing boards, strikes out the authority, inserted by the Senate, for the purchase of commodities or services for the purpose of securing compliance with the law; makes available for traveling expenses, not to exceed \$7,250,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$8,925,659 as proposed by the Senate; accepts the Senate amendment striking out the House limitation with respect to use of the appropriation, directly or indirectly, for preparing or carrying out any subsidy program; accepts the Senate amendment striking out the House provision prohibiting use of the appropriation for roll-backs on any food commodity which has not yet reached parity nor on any commodity which is not a necessity; the House bill contains a limitation on use of the Office of Price Administration appropriation prohibiting payment of salary to any person who engages in or directs the formulation of price policy, price ceiling, or maximum price with respect to any article or commodity unless such person has had not less than 5 years of continuous actual business experience in the particular line of business to which the price relates; the Senate struck out this limitation; the conference agreement restores the prohibition modified so as to provide that the appropriation shall not be used for the salary of any person who directs the formulation of a price policy, maximum price, or price ceiling with respect to any article or commodity unless, in the judgment of the Administrator, such person shall be qualified by experience in business, industry, or commerce.

No. 10: The House bill contained a limitation on the funds for the Office of Strategic Services prohibiting their use for the salary of any person who at the time of employment thereunder is in the active armed forces of the United States. The Senate struck out this provision and the House accepts the Senate amendment.

No. 12: Appropriates \$30,735,000 for the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, instead of \$30,785,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$30,685,000 as proposed by the House.

Nos. 13 and 14, relating to the National War Labor Board: Appropriates \$14,091,300, instead of \$13,841,300 as proposed by the House and \$14,341,900 as proposed by the Senate; and allows \$1,369,613 for travel as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,350,000 as proposed by the House.

Nos. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23, relating to the Office of War Information: Appropriates \$33,222,504, instead of \$35,037,593 as proposed by the Senate and \$28,972,504 as proposed by the House; allocates \$24,000,000 to the Overseas Operations Branch, instead of \$25,003,590 as proposed by the Senate and \$22,500,000 as proposed by the House; allocates \$2,750,000 for the Domestic Operations Branch, instead of \$3,561,499 as proposed by the Senate and nothing as proposed by the House; retains the bureau earmarking for the Domestic Operations Branch proposed by the Senate modified so as to include the Book and Magazine Coordination Sections but to omit the amount earmarked proposed by the Senate except not to exceed \$50,000 for the Motion Picture Bureau and not to exceed \$500,000 for liquidation expenses; permits the use of not more than \$75,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$50,000 as proposed by the House, for temporary employment in the United States without regard to civil service and classification law; limits travel within the United States to not to exceed \$400,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the House; limits printing and binding expenses within the continental United States to \$1,400,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,400,000 as proposed by the House; makes not to exceed \$175,000 available for entertainment expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$145,000 as proposed by the House; and inserts the paragraph proposed by the Senate prohibiting use of the funds of the Office of War Information for preparation or publication of any pamphlet or other literature for distribution within the United States modified so as to relate the prohibition to "public distribution."

Nos. 26, 27, and 28, relating to the War Production Board: Appropriates \$89,267,720, instead of \$88,200,000 as proposed by the House and \$89,335,440 as proposed by the Senate; makes \$203,720 available for salaries for the Information Division, instead of \$136,000 as proposed by the House and \$271,440 as proposed by the Senate; and makes a technical correction in the citation of a statute.

No. 29: Appropriates \$48,170,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$43,170,000 as proposed by the Senate for the War Relocation Authority.

Nos. 30 and 31: Makes technical corrections in the general provisions applicable to the constituent units of the Office for Emergency Management.

AMENDMENTS REPORTED IN DISAGREEMENT

No. 2: Relating to the use of the funds of the Board of Economic Warfare. The managers on the part of the House will move to accept the Senate amendment with an amendment.

No. 11: Relating to the Office of Civilian Defense. The Senate amendment continues available in 1944 not to exceed \$13,359,600 of the unexpended balance of funds heretofore

appropriated for procurement of protective equipment for civilian defense and allows \$400,000 for administrative expenses. The House managers will move to accept the Senate amendment providing \$10,500,000 of such balance and \$700,000 for administrative expense.

No. 24: Relating to the Office of War Information. The Senate amendment prohibits supplementation from any other source of the funds carried in the bill. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 25: Appropriating \$138,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of War Mobilization. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 32: The Senate amendment makes the funds in the Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1944, available to carry out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act amendments of 1943. The House managers will move to recede and concur.

Nos. 33 and 34: The Senate amendment prohibits use of any of the funds in the bill for the payment of any persons in any of the war agencies included in the bill receiving a salary of \$4,500 or more unless such persons have been appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The House managers will move further to insist on disagreement to the Senate amendments.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
J. W. DITTER,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the executive office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask to be recognized for such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the significant feature of the conference report is the unanimity with which it is approved and with which it is supported by all members of the conference committees, both of the House and of the Senate.

In securing agreement of something like a score of men on a bill covering the widest possible range of war activities, it is reasonable to suppose there would be a wide divergence of opinion on many of the items included in such a report. It is particularly notable, therefore, that without a single exception all managers, both those on the part of the House and those on the part of the Senate, are in

complete agreement on every item presented in the report. All have subscribed to the report and all have announced their intention to support it, and every item in it, on the floor here this afternoon.

This is a very difficult bill and a bill of exceptional importance. It bears the same direct relation to the successful prosecution of the war as that borne by bills providing for armament. It has required more exhaustive and exhausting attention than any bill considered by the Committee on Appropriations within my memory. We opened hearing on the estimates immediately on our return to Washington following the brief Easter recess, and devoted 5 solid weeks to hearings, Saturdays and holidays.

The clerk of the committee, Mr. Shield, who has so efficiently served the committee and the Congress for considerably in excess of a third of a century, is authority for the statement that it is the most difficult bill reported out by the committee during his long legislative experience. And the fact that all members of the conference committee, all of them veterans of long experience in the House, after extensive and intensive study of the estimates and the evidence have agreed on this report is sufficient to suggest that other Members of the House who may have had less opportunity to study the bill should consider it with some care and circumspection before taking exception to the carefully considered conclusions finally adopted by unanimous approval of the conferees.

The bill is extensive in its application as well as in the appropriations recommended. It provides for 18 war agencies, all of which have been so thoroughly studied and debated in the passage of the bill that I shall not impose on the time of the House to again discuss them, but shall digress long enough to mention 3 which have been the subject of especial interest and criticism.

The Office of Price Administration, for which the House provided \$130,000,000 and the Senate \$177,000,000, is recommended in the conference report for an appropriation of \$155,000,000. The provisions denying funds for subsidies and roll-backs are omitted due to the vote in the House yesterday sustaining a veto of similar provisions in the Commodity Credit bill. The requirement that certain employees have 5 years' experience was modified to require, within the judgment of the Administrator, such employees be qualified by experience in business, industry, or commerce.

The appropriation for the Office of War Information, fixed by the House at \$29,000,000, with no provision for the Domestic Operations Branch, and by the Senate at \$35,000,000 with \$3,500,000 for domestic operations, is compromised in the conference report at \$33,000,000, with an allocation of \$2,750,000 for domestic operations. The specific allocations provided by the Senate are omitted in the appropriation recommended in the conference report, and the item is earmarked as to activities rather than amounts.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I am interested in knowing whether or not your committee recommends the continuation of the publication by the Division of Public Inquiries of the Office of War Information of a bulletin which, I believe, is known here as the Government War Manual. It has been published throughout the country, and I believe they have been charging a dollar for it. Is provision made for it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We provided in the report, as the gentleman will note when it is available, a prohibition against their preparing any pamphlet or literature for public distribution in the United States.

Mr. NORRELL. This cannot be published then?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This bill prohibits public distribution. I believe it can be distributed for Government use.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Further answering the gentleman from Arkansas, I may say that this manual has never been printed for public distribution; it is only for distribution to Members of Congress. The other copies are for sale and are not therefore for public distribution.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under the provision in this bill, I doubt that it can be distributed either for sale or gratuitously to the public. We have an express prohibition against the public distribution of pamphlets or literature in the United States.

Mr. NORRELL. Then this manual cannot in the future be published and distributed to Members of Congress or other Government employees?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Not for public distribution.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Only for their own use and benefit and information.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We did not deny them the right to distribute publications within the Department itself and to agencies which they serve. To have done that would have prevented them from circulating orders and information essential to the discharge of their duties; but we do prohibit distribution to the public.

Mr. NORRELL. As far as this manual is concerned then it would be possible if they saw fit to continue the publication of it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I doubt if it will be available to the public.

Mr. NORRELL. But will be for the exclusive use of Members of Congress and Government employees?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. And for sale.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It will be available for all Government agencies.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Will it not be available to the public for sale?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I doubt if that can be done.

Mr. Speaker, in the domestic branch of the Office of War Information we accepted the Senate amendment to the extent that we recommend an appropriation of \$2,750,000 for domestic operations, but eliminate the provision of the Senate earmarking specific amounts for specific purposes. The conference report proposes to earmark services and activities, but not amounts of money for each, with the exception of the motion picture bureau, for which we specified \$50,000.

For the War Relocation Authority the report restored the \$5,000,000 reduction of the Senate and retained the figure provided by the House. It appears that the reduction by the Senate of the amount provided for the War Relocation Authority was made on the theory that we are treating the evacuees a little bit too leniently and providing for them a little too luxuriously. As a matter of fact we are providing for them only as required to under the Geneva Agreement.

It is also evident that the cut was made on the theory that by reducing the appropriation they would prevent further release of evacuees from the relocation centers. That, as will be readily understood, was a misapprehension, for unless sufficient money is provided to keep these people in the centers they must be released.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the bill as it now stands contemplates keeping those Japanese as they have been kept thus far and not releasing them?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The bill provides sufficient money to take care of those who are to be held in the relocation centers.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman for that assurance because my people have great apprehension regarding the number of Japs being released from the relocation camps.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this conference report covers the appropriations for all of the so-called war agencies.

The major items in difference were the Office of Price Administration and the Office of War Information. A compromise has been worked out and I propose to discuss this compromise. I do not propose to discuss anything that was not in dispute.

The amount of money allowed for the Office of Price Administration in this bill is \$155,000,000. I am going to be perfectly frank. This is more than the House allowed, but it is \$22,000,000 less than the Senate allowed. It is \$10,000,000 less than the House Appropriations Committee allowed. On the other hand, it comes to exactly the figure I thought they needed after I had spent

a long time listening to the hearings and analyzing them very carefully.

I do not want to be responsible for turning this agency loose to go to work unless it has money enough to do a decent job. It has money enough, in my opinion, with that figure to do a decent job. They will need it if they do the job and do it right. They are going to require a very large additional sum of money to operate the local offices and provide the help there with pay as they should be provided with pay. On the other hand, they can save a very large sum of money by getting rid of those long hairs in the Department who have messed up the price and rationing situation so terribly for the last 12 months.

They have not been cleaned out and they must be cleaned out if that office is to operate successfully, whether they operate by means of price control or by means of subsidy. They will have to clean out a large number of the district and regional offices and close most of them. It is expected that they will because those officers have been a menace to the administration of the law.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I will after I have finished, because I only have a few moments left.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to talk about the regional offices.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, we have not included the amendment with reference to subsidy. This is the picture with reference to subsidies: That was in the bill providing for an extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The House refused to override the veto. Under the circumstances, this bill would go to the White House, it would be vetoed, the bill would not be passed over the veto, and we would be in just the same shape that we are in so far as the Commodity Credit Corporation matter is concerned.

At present here is the situation on prices and subsidies. The thing has been provided for in the commodity Credit Corporation extension resolution that was passed by the House without a record vote yesterday. I believe that it is dangerous, I believe that it is highly inflationary, and I believe that any program of price control is going to result in terrific inflation and terrific distress just so long as it is carried on by the same bungling type of administration that the long hairs have provided in the O. P. A.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that we can get a successful administration or that we can prevent inflation so long as the long hairs are in a position to decide anything.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN], which is in the bill, with revision, in amendment No. 8, and the Clerk has read it, and we have it here available for information, will result in putting people

in charge of the formulation of policies on price control and rationing who are experienced business people and who will know enough to handle it and get rid of the long hairs in key positions.

With reference to O. W. I., the provision for the Foreign Service is in the hands of an outfit that at the present time has too much help for its own good and for proper administration. It has very many people in there who should be eliminated from the roll because they are not proper. We have compromised on that at \$24,000,000 which, in my opinion, is too high.

With reference to the Domestic Branch as against an estimate of \$8,000,000, a House committee recommendation of \$5,500,000, and the House action of nothing, we have compromised on \$2,750,000.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. The O. W. I. has for the fiscal year 1943, \$8,850,000?

Mr. TABER. That is true. The \$2,750,000, in my opinion, is too much. On the other hand, we have got to get to a compromise on things if we are going to get legislation. We have eliminated entirely all propaganda in the United States. There are some sections in the O. W. I. that, in my opinion, could be eliminated or cut down very materially. It will be up to Mr. Hoyt, the new Director of the Domestic Branch, to co-ordinate this situation and clean it up. I believe that our compromise has had to be made not on the basis of need but on the basis of providing some jobs for some of those fellows who are in there. I hope that Mr. Hoyt, the new Director, will take that into consideration when it comes to cleaning that situation up and that he will eliminate those who are absolutely worthless and get rid of them. That is what he has to do if he is going to make a success of it, there is no other way. I have yielded on this \$2,750,000 largely as a result of the importunings of the gentleman from Indiana, who has been a great compromiser, but I still think it is up to Mr. Hoyt to save at least a million and a half out of that \$2,750,000 if he cleans the thing up and gets rid of the unnecessary help, as I believe he should.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman constantly referred to the word "compromise."

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. GAVIN. I would suggest that the gentleman change that word to "capitulation."

Mr. TABER. It is not a capitulation.

Mr. GAVIN. Most of this is.

Mr. TABER. There are some things this agency needs to do. It needs to go over all of the releases of Government departments and cut out nine-tenths of their crazy publications. It needs to eliminate as far as it can by supervision the unnecessary sending out of articles. For instance, right this day 1 Member

showed me 12 duplicate articles sent out by one bureau addressed to the same man at the same address, from the same unit. That kind of business must stop, and this agency is the one that is supposed to stop it. They also should cut out nine-tenths of the governmental propaganda that is going on. It is absolutely worthless and a menace to the Government.

In addition to cutting out their own publications, it is the duty of O. W. I. to prevent the publication of propaganda and other useless and wasteful publications. This they are not doing. I believe that if they would use their money intelligently and cut out that kind of material they would make a good record. The other things they need to do are to give out the news that needs to be given out with reference to the war, to get rid of these conflicting statements, and see that the news is given to the people promptly and accurately so that they will know what is going on.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina, Governor MORRISON.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, one of the grandest things I ever expect to witness was this House by practically a unanimous vote appropriating \$29,000,000,000 to the Navy Department and a little later \$71,000,000,000 to the War Department to furnish the resources with which our combat forces can carry our Government to victory.

It is almost incomprehensible that the very same personnel composing this House could descend on other occasions to the smallest wrangles, partisan in character, and sometimes sectional in character, over very little things.

During the last war—I remember it so well, and went through its sufferings, not as a soldier, for I was an old man then—the great President, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Hoover, afterward President, and Barney Baruch pretty well conducted our economic fight, and were criticized and abused throughout it. Now they are lauded every day in the press of the country which is criticizing current affairs. As a man of my party, I thought the last war was gloriously conducted by the able triumvirate I mentioned, but it does not approach the wisdom and success with which we are now conducting our difficulties through this trouble. We have much better managed inflation; we have much better managed prices; we have much better managed supplies and the rationing of food. I think that, instead of our little quarrels, if we would search ourselves, we would find that a great deal of it was partisan, a great deal of it growing out of a man's idea that he can conduct anything better than somebody else is doing it. There are more people about Washington attending to everybody else's business than I ever saw in my life. The legislative branch of the Government wants to attend to the business of the executive or administrative branch of the Government, it seems to me, and all the men in authority have either long hair or curiously made heads, in the opinion of some of us, while there

is a tendency on the part of some of the executives to think Congress is something it ought not to be. As a matter of fact, we are doing very well. Let us search ourselves and divest ourselves of every vestige of partisanship and class consciousness and get under the flag and go through our difficulties in unity, as near as we can, recognizing that the responsibility of the lawmaking power is to legislate and that of the administrative branch is to execute and administer. When it is over, I imagine we are going to find that some of these so-called bureaucrats are as good as we are and that they have rendered a great service to the American people.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the effort to terminate the domestic activities of O. W. I., it is consistent to make it a matter of record that this bipartisan move has no connection with the resignation of Gardner Cowles, Jr., of Iowa, as director of the domestic bureau. Mr. Cowles agreed to stay until June 1943, and no longer, when he was drafted by the President personally 1 year ago. His resignation and the selection of Palmer Hoyt, of Oregon, as his successor were announced before the O. W. I. appropriation came out of committee.

During his year here Mr. Cowles was one of the forces for sanity in O. W. I. Members will recall that he was opposed to the radical pamphleteers in O. W. I. They fought him back, but it is of lasting credit to Mr. Cowles that he succeeded in divorcing a dozen or more of them from the O. W. I. pay roll. Perhaps a check-up would reveal that they were immediately hired by some other New Deal agency, for that seems to be the procedure when any reforms in personnel in any given bureau are accomplished. Our war effort would be speeded up if men like Gardner Cowles, Jr., were held here and given more authority to do a job.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as a former newspaper man well acquainted with the handling of news matter prior to the formation of O. W. I. and afterward, I wish to show briefly why the newspaper industry and the people of this country need a good, strong, well-managed domestic branch of the Office of War Information.

Newspapers received their news of the war from four different sources, the Army, the Navy, the Office of War Information, and such news as we pick up with our own reporters. The Office of Censorship through the censorship code governs the news we develop in our own communities. The O. W. I. coordinates and delivers the news from 102 different Government agencies which, prior to O. W. I., were sending out gobs and reams of useless and utterly worthless releases. We found in many instances, before the O. W. I. was formed, sharply varying stories on identical subjects being issued

the same day. I recall distinctly printing in the newspaper I published before I came here, on the front page one day a story quoting the President as saying there was no need to worry about rubber, and in the column next to it, under the same size head, we quoted Leon Henderson as saying there not rubber enough to run 3 weeks. What were the people to believe?

Mr. Speaker, I believe the domestic branch of the Office of War Information is badly needed and should be strongly supported.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity as I did on a previous question to say that despite my great admiration for some of the gentlemen who attacked O. W. I., and despite my respect and admiration for the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I am convinced that the amount of the appropriation in this instance for the domestic functions of O. W. I. is inadequate, and I call the attention of those throughout the country in the Civilian Defense set-up to the fact that once this cut is made in the appropriation, the many things that they have used time after time so helpfully, will be denied them, because of the action of this House. I shall vote for the conference report, but I regret the cut in the appropriation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to state that I, too, regret very much that the appropriation for the O. W. I. and the O. P. A. have been cut so drastically. Coming from the district I do, composed mainly of consumers, and speaking particularly of the O. P. A., we feel that the O. P. A. is doing a fine job to control prices and keep the cost of living down. I am afraid that this cut may make their job much more difficult, perhaps impossible.

At this time I would like to make mention of one amendment that I am glad to see modified, which would have provided that policy-making officials of the O. P. A. must have at least 5 years' experience in the particular business or industry in which they are making rules as employees of the O. P. A. I agree that there may have been too many long-haired theorists and professors in the O. P. A., but I think it would be too much to ask that a man who has had particular experience in a given field should have had at least 5 years' experience in that field. I think the amendment as now written is much better, leaving it to the Administrator to decide whether the policy-making official has had some experience in business. That may possibly do away with a lot of the theory that has crept in in the writing of the regulations which has had the effect of forcing many small businesses out of existence. It seems to have been the policy of some of the people in the O. P. A. to deliberately go out of their way to put people out of business. I hope that will

be corrected. However, I hope they will not go to the other extreme and take in a large number of representatives of big business who will attempt to put into effect the policies of their firms or industries. They should have people from all fields and all types of business, whose purpose it will be to carry out the President's "hold the line" order and also to see that the small businessman may be kept in business.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, there is a newspaper published in the city of New York known as the New York Post. I very seldom read it, but when I do have occasion to look at it I find it is one newspaper in New York that 365 days out of the year is damning the Congress of the United States. It is one newspaper that from the earliest day has advocated every bit of legislation and every act that has precipitated the war, and that has urged full compliance with all of the New Deal orders, and so on, and have damned and criticized anybody who dared to find any fault with the New Deal. Yet I find this to be the fact.

In accordance with and confirmed by a telephone conversation which I had with Harry N. Bitner, Chief of the Printing and Publishing Section of the W. P. B., these facts came to me yesterday: That on May 17, 1943, W. B. Chandler, then Chief of the Publishing and Printing Section of the W. P. B., directed a letter to W. John Logan, Chief of the Compliance Section of the W. P. B., advising him of the violation of the New York Post of W. P. B. regulation in respect to the excessive use of newsprint during the first quarter of 1943. On May 21, 1943, Harry N. Bitner, who succeeded Mr. Chandler as Chief of the Publishing and Printing Section of W. P. B., wrote to the Chief of the Compliance Section making inquiry as to the disposition of the complaint filed on May 17. Inquiry was made again on June 21, of M. S. Vernon, Deputy Director of the Compliance Section of the W. P. B. for information as to the disposition of the complaint filed. On June 20 Mr. Bitner was advised by a letter from the Chief of the Compliance Section that the investigation of this matter had not yet been completed, that information had been requested from the director of the regional office of the Compliance Section in New York, and no further information was available.

Mr. Speaker, we are now in the third quarter of the year. During the first quarter of this year the Chief of the Publishing and Printing Section of the W. P. B. directed a complaint to the Compliance Section of that organization advising it of a violation of the law and the orders of the W. P. B. by this New Deal New York Post newspaper, the newspaper that has been damning Congress and everybody else who dared to oppose anything that the New Deal advocated, and yet we find that newspaper is perhaps the only newspaper in the country that has violated the orders of the W. P. B. in the excessive use of newsprint. Now, I asked the Com-

pliance Section of the W. P. B. since this complaint was filed with it on May 17, 1943, and since repeated demands have been made upon it by the Printing and Publishing Section of the W. P. B. for information, what are you going to do about this complaint? Are you going to ignore it, simply because the New York Post is 100-percent New Deal newspaper? Does the constant adherence to the philosophy of the New Deal immunize a newspaper from prosecution for violation of the plain orders of the W. P. B.? I hope these questions will come to the attention of the gentlemen down in the Compliance Section, and that they will tell the Congress and the people what has held up their prosecution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, due to the intensive lobbying campaign staged by the O. P. A. during the past 48 hours against the so-called grade-labeling amendment which was adopted by both Houses as a rider to the O. P. A. appropriation bill, I deem it advisable, as the author of the amendment, to make a statement clarifying the purpose and objective of it. The O. P. A. is trying to raise a smoke screen and to cause confusion for legitimate industries in the country. The sole objective of the amendment is to stop the O. P. A. from issuing regulations which compel changes in business practices or methods of distribution for commodities and articles of merchandise.

Section 2 (h) of the price-control law of January 30, 1942, provides:

The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act.

The amendment which was offered by me to the O. P. A. appropriation is H. R. 2968, reads as follows:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promulgation or enforcement of orders requiring grade labeling or standardization of food products, wearing apparel, or other processed or manufactured commodities or articles.

Referring first to the provision of the price-control law of January 30, 1942, which prohibits the O. P. A. from compelling changes in business practices and methods of distribution, we all know that this agency has consistently sought by regulation and order to violate the spirit of the law and to compel industries to depart from the customary methods of distribution of food and other articles. The policy makers in the O. P. A. are determined, as a reform measure, to standardize and grade label all foods and manufactured articles necessary for civilian use. O. P. A. regulations in this respect also attempt to do away with trade names and brands and to limit the choice of articles or food for civilian demand.

My amendment will permit legitimate business in the United States to continue their operations as in the past—using customary business practices and methods of distribution when it comes to grade labeling, brands, and trade marks, and prohibits the O. P. A. from promulgating or enforcing new regulations in this respect unless the industry affected by the new regulation is in agreement.

The lumber industry will continue to use the customary grades established by the industry and its trade, and there is nothing to the claim of the O. P. A. that all historic grades used in the past will be thrown out. Canners of fruits and vegetables will continue to operate under their historic brands and trade names, and manufacturers of hosiery, wearing apparel, and other foods and products, will be permitted to continue as in the past, without being standardized by a reform policy of the O. P. A.

The Office of Price Administration will confine its pricing policy to legitimate and customary grades, brands, and trade-marks of food and articles, and it will be prohibited in its attempt to standardize articles of food for human use and consumption. I trust that this explanation of the amendment will clear up the confusion caused by the O. P. A., and that this agency will hereafter follow the law as intended by Congress.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield. Mr. ANGELL. Will the gentleman explain whether or not the amendment, part of which he has just read and of which he is the author, is broad enough to cover log price ceilings and grades in the lumber industry? I have received a great many telegrams from lumbermen in my district complaining that they have been advised by the legal department of O. P. A. that it does, and they will have to do away with all these grades in lumber, which will demoralize the whole industry. One of the telegrams to which I refer reads as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., July 2, 1943.
Congressman HOMER ANGELL,
Washington, D. C.:

House-Senate conference report on War Agencies Appropriations Act has inserted in pending bill covering Office of Price Administration following clause: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the promulgation or enforcement of orders requiring grade labeling or standardization of food products, wearing apparel, or other processed or manufactured commodities, or articles." We have been advised Office of Price Administration legal department has interpreted phrase, "or other processed or manufactured commodities or articles," as including logs, lumber, and plywood. Elimination of Office of Price Administration log grade enforcement would mean virtual repeal of log price ceiling. Inflationary log prices, coupled with chaotic condition in lumber industry would result. This, in turn, would drastically increase plywood production cost and necessitate immediate upward revision of plywood prices. Furthermore, if Office of Price Administration enforcement of plywood sales on basis of long-established grades is eliminated, confusion and possible upgrading will occur. We believe intent of conference committee was to limit their report to foods and wearing apparel and certainly was not intended to in-

clude the lumber and logging industries. We strongly urge you to immediately call on House conference committee members or take up on floor of Senate if necessary, suggesting that above clause be amended to specifically state that plywood, logs, and lumber are not to be defined as "other processed or manufactured commodities or articles." The conference report will be submitted to both House and Senate for adoption today, Saturday; hence, imperative action be taken to prevent inadvertent enactment of law which would seriously embarrass lumber industry.

THE M. & M. WOODWORKING CO.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad the gentleman brought that up. My amendment, which has been adopted by both Houses, and which is not involved in this conference report, has nothing to do with pricing. All it seeks to do is to compel the O. P. A. to live up to the price-control law which was passed in January 1942, and it permits the lumber industry to maintain the grades that existed prior to the establishment of the O. P. A., upon which grades the O. P. A. will have to establish a price ceiling.

Mr. ANGELL. As I understand it, this amendment is not in disagreement at this time and under the parliamentary procedure it is not possible to offer an amendment?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is not possible to offer an amendment because it has been concurred in by both Houses of the Congress.

Mr. NORMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield. Mr. NORMAN. The gentleman thinks it would still be possible to have different ceiling prices for different qualities or grades or species of lumber just as we now have?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And just as you had prior to the O. P. A. My amendment simply prohibits the O. P. A. from going on with its reform program, contrary to the intent of Congress.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield. Mr. ELLSWORTH. Is it not true that the present methods and grades used in the lumber industry have been there a long time and that they are the usual trade practices, and therefore not affected by this amendment, as claimed by the O. P. A.?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There can be no question about what the gentleman has said.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield. Mr. TABER. The War Production Board has jurisdiction over this standardization matter rather than the O. P. A. All they have to do is to fix the prices after the standards.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in whatever may be the final disposition of this conference report I strongly counsel

against any further cut in the appropriation for the Office of War Information. In my opinion that office already has been cut altogether too deeply. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] a few minutes ago stated to the House that the conferees are asking you to appropriate \$2,750,000 to carry on the domestic branch of the Office of War Information during the fiscal year 1944.

I call attention to the fact that while the gentleman has correctly stated the over-all appropriation recommended for that branch, \$500,000 of that amount is for liquidation purposes, which reduces the appropriation for operating purposes to the irreducible minimum of \$2,250,000. How in the world it will be possible to carry on the essential functions of the domestic branch of the Office of War Information on that amount I do not know. I hope a kind Providence will point out to Elmer Davis how it can be done.

Let us trace the history of the Office of War Information and see how drastically its appropriation has been cut. In the fiscal year 1943 just closed the domestic branch of the Office of War Information had \$8,800,000 as its operating fund. For the fiscal year 1944 upon which we are entering the Bureau of the Budget allowed the Office of War Information \$8,500,000 for its domestic operating branch. Our Subcommittee on Deficiencies recommended \$5,500,000, which was a drastic cut. The House struck out the appropriation for the domestic branch entirely. The Senate reinserted an appropriation of \$3,561,000 and in conference we obtained an agreement of \$2,750,000, of which, as stated above, \$500,000 is to pay liquidating bills on services of the domestic branch that are being closed out under the diminished appropriation. The actual amount allowed the domestic branch for operation in the fiscal year 1944 is \$6,550,000 less than that branch had during the fiscal year 1943 just ended.

I am one of those who think that Elmer Davis is not getting a square deal. With splendid zeal he has applied all of the faculties of his brilliant mind in an indefatigable effort to do a good job. If ever a man went to superlative lengths in trying to serve his country conscientiously and well, that man is Elmer Davis. The very nature of his position makes it a maelstrom of conflicting forces and I doubt whether there is a man alive who could do a better job of harnessing the heterogeneous elements and making them work together than Elmer Davis has done. He has a fine vision and has done a great amount of good in many directions, notably in extending United Nations propaganda into Axis countries and he is capable of doing a great deal more toward winning the war if he is given half a chance. Just now criticism of him is at flood tide, much of it politically inspired, but I know something about the earnestness that motivates him and I predict that if he is given the support he ought to have, or anything like it, he will make a record of useful service in these crucial times that he and his family and friends may look upon with pride in the years to come.

Amid the trials and tribulations that surround Mr. Davis he reminds me of the patriarch Job, who also was on the hot spot most of the time. I think it is safe to say that Elmer has more troubles than Job ever had boils—painful, festering troubles. Like Job, he is gifted with patience that is as resilient as a No. 1 grade of rubber, and after every rebuff he bounces back smiling. The Biblical Encyclopedia, page 217, in discussing the Book of Job says:

All that we know of the author is that he was a literary genius with a rich and original mind.

That reminds me of Elmer Davis. Discussing the purpose of the Book of Job, the same authority says:

The book is a saga with a historical foundation based on a figure of long ago. The popular story or prose part teaches that despite our wariness Satan overcomes us, but God will reward us in the end.

This leads to some hope that Elmer Davis will come out all right in the end. Satan is landing on him with some stiff uppercuts now, but his time may be coming.

I plead with you, ladies and gentlemen of the House, to be fair to Elmer Davis. He is handling a big job efficiently and in a big way, and he needs our consolation to take his mind off of the boils.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I want the RECORD to show that I am opposed to the compromises, so-called, but in reality complete capitulation on these various amendments involving O. P. A. In the first place, this conference report provides for the acceptance of Senate amendment No. 7 relative to the House antissubsidy provision. Only yesterday by a majority of 74 the House indicated that it is opposed to the use of Federal subsidies for rolling back food prices. On various other occasions the House has taken similar action.

Another reason I am opposed to this increase of \$25,000,000 above the amount recommended by the House for the administration of O. P. A. is because during the current year the O. P. A. has had approximately 50,000 employees, and under this proposal brought in by the conference committee the O. P. A. will probably be permitted to expand its personnel an additional 10,000. I am opposed to those concessions which are in conflict with the desire of the House to curb expansion of bureaucratic activities which are a direct threat to the war effort on the home front.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include an address that I made yesterday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] 2 minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this conference report. Before coming to the main point of my remarks I want to say that I particularly favor the better treatment given herein to O. W. I. and O. P. A. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] said something about curbing the powers of the long hairs, whatever he meant by that. Can it be that the gentleman thinks that unless an administrator of one of these vital war agencies is picked from the Republican Party or from big business, he is utterly incompetent? Those in charge of O. P. A. have an almost superhuman task to carry on regardless of their party affiliations or their business experience and connection. O. P. A. needs help more in the local districts. I find that it is being poorly administered in some places because they do not have the help which they need out in the localities where it must be administered. I am sorry that more was not furnished for out there.

However, I rose chiefly to commend the committee and especially the chairman of that committee for his assurance given me a moment ago in regard to the sufficiency of funds to keep properly the Japanese who are interned in concentration camps and in relocation camps.

In my State there are two large relocation camps. We did not ask that they be located in Arizona but we do ask that they be properly managed. There have been a great many complaints that those Japs have been given better care than they should have been given. I trust that in this bill enough money has been appropriated to take care of those people in a proper manner according to international law and treaty conventions. That is all we ask to be done for them and all which ought to be done.

On the other hand, a great many of my people are complaining that there are too many dangerous Japanese being turned loose. Congress must furnish enough funds to keep all these people who need to be kept for the safety of our country. That is why I asked the chairman a moment ago if there were sufficient funds in this appropriation to take care of all Japanese who ought to be in relocation camps. Candidly, I do not want them in Arizona.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to express my position on the pending conference report. I am not satisfied with the capitulation of the House conferees on two items for the O. P. A., nor their capitulation on the O. W. I. program.

I realize, however, there come times when there must be a certain amount of compromise in order to get any legislation through, particularly at certain stages of its consideration and at the end of a session.

The Senate restored a portion of the funds asked for the domestic operations branch of the O. W. I. The House conferees succeeded in obtaining a reduction from the amount which the Senate

approved. During the past fiscal year the domestic operation branch of the O. W. I. used a little more than \$8,500,000 for its operation. It did seek to censor the press; it did indulge in propaganda activities on the domestic front. Of the sum of \$2,700,000 which is provided for O. W. I. for the fiscal year 1944, a half million dollars is for liquidation purposes. Three branches have been entirely eliminated; the most objectionable features of the domestic branch of the O. W. I. have been completely eliminated.

It has been my privilege to discuss with the newly appointed Director of the Domestic Operations Branch of the O. W. I., Mr. E. P. Hoyt of Oregon, what his policy is to be. This gentleman's character and ability have been ably defended by the Senators from Oregon and also by the Representatives from that great State.

Mr. Hoyt has been one of the bitterest critics of the censorship efforts in the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I. His statements concerning this effort have been brought to the attention of the public through the press of the Nation.

As a reputable Republican newspaperman of long experience and a newspaperman who has successful practical experience in the newspaper field, he has assured the leadership of the House, both Democratic and Republican; the conferees for the House; and he has assured me personally that he is opposed to press censorship of domestic policies or domestic issues and there will be no attempt at censorship under his administration. He furthermore stated he was opposed to tinging or coloring domestic news and that there would be none under his administration. He is a decent, honorable man, and I take him at his word. I hope that Mr. Elmer Davis, a brilliant man in the radio and the newspaper field, and a member of the American Labor Party of New York City, will permit Mr. E. P. Hoyt, a reputable, outstanding Republican newspaperman and an outstanding American from the State of Oregon, operate the Domestic Operation Branch of the O. W. I. so that it will not attempt to censor the press nor attempt to propagandize the people of this country along class and socialistic lines, such as was done during the past 12 months.

I yield now to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I agree with every word the gentleman from Alabama has said with reference to Mr. Hoyt, who has become the head of the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I.

Mr. Hoyt, as the gentleman from Alabama has stated, is the publisher of the Portland Oregonian in my district, a man of outstanding qualifications, with long experience in the newspaper profession, and I am certain from my own acquaintance of long standing with him that he will perform his duties as he indicated to the gentleman from Alabama. I am sure his only desire is to advance the war effort and make available to the public all the news free from propaganda and unadulterated with political considerations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, when the previous question is ordered on the adoption of a conference report, would it be in order to offer a preferential motion to recommit the bill for further disagreement to specific amendments?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I only yielded time to the gentleman for the purpose of debate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to the gentleman that I am merely making a parliamentary inquiry. I made no motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In answer to the gentleman's inquiry, the Chair states that it would be in order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress must pursue his legislative responsibility in his own way. I recognize that in a bicameral legislative system there come times when it is necessary to compromise. I believe, however, that sometimes the gentle art of compromise becomes a little too facile. The great issues which have marked the history of the Republic have been met in most cases by determination and courage not to compromise.

I regret exceedingly that I must depart from the position taken by the very able gentlemen who compromised the different committee items with respect to this bill.

An amendment was submitted on the floor of this House and was adopted by a substantial vote, which reduced the appropriation for the Office of Price Administration by \$30,000,000. There has been a compromise on that and \$20,000,000 has been restored. I believe that is an indefensible action, in my own judgment at least, and so I cannot go along with the suggestions from the conference committee. The people demand retrenchment. I am persuaded that greater efficiency in O. P. A. will enable them to perform their responsibilities with \$130,000,000.

The second amendment on which the conferees yielded, or yielded substantially, was that provision which would require 5 years of business experience on the part of the executive price directors and the officials under him who actually formulate price policies. As is now being provided, that becomes a discretionary power lodged in the Administrator and in my considered judgment, although restrictive, has limited the possibilities of bringing more business experience into the Office of Price Administration. I was rather amazed at the paucity of the testimony before the Senate Committee on those two items. The House approved this proposal by a vote of 183 to 144. The testimony is incontrovertible that scores of price executives came direct from academic halls to O. P. A. No effort has been made to controvert that statement. It is now proposed to recede on this position and per-

mit the condition to continue. It remains no longer a bureaucracy but a neocracy, which according to definition is Government by untried or inexperienced hands. Too many business enterprises have already suspended operations and too many are in danger of suspending business in the near future to blink this condition and I must keep the record straight on this point. But the conferees have yielded.

The third amendment on which there was compromise was that which related to subsidies and roll-backs. You will recall that we interdicted the use of any funds for anyone who was engaged in the preparation or calculation of subsidies. The Senate I think probably took the position that the House ought to recede on that item in view of the action taken on the bill to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. That, however, had been enacted by both Houses and was vetoed, although a very distinct majority of the Members of this House voted to override the veto. There will therefore be no further opportunity before the recess to record ourselves on that issue unless it should come in the form of a Senate amendment to the Commodity Credit Corporation bill now being considered by the other body.

There are three items in the conference report with which I am not satisfied and so, in accord with the ruling just made by the Speaker that a privileged motion will be in order to recommit the conference report with instructions to the conferees, such a motion will be made when the previous question is ordered on the conference report. I speak only for myself. I cannot go along with this action.

If the language of these amendments is deemed to be faulty, then an effort should be made to concur with other language which sets forth the clear intent of this body and is at the same time calculated to meet Senate favor. There is no evidence of such action before us.

If it be argued that the Senate will accept no other position, then it should be made quite clear that the House is a patient body, devoted to its convictions and willing to take the time necessary to translate such convictions into law.

I was not a little astonished at the meagerness of the testimony on all of these items before the Senate committee as indicated in the hearings. Virtually on the statement of the Administrator alone was the House position reversed.

In the light of these circumstances I deem it a clear duty to submit the privileged motion to instruct further disagreement on the part of those who represent the House in this conference.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this bill which we are considering now should have been the law several days ago. The fact that it is not the law, however, is no fault of the House of Representatives. There is no need, however, to follow that observation any further. The fact remains that there are a great many important activities

in this bill; agencies and departments vitally necessary in the conduct of the war which are out of funds, and there is every reason for the greatest expedition in the consideration of this bill.

A great many amendments were inserted in the bill by the Senate. The House conferees had a number of meetings. They worked hard to uphold the position of the House, and the result we bring you is the best we could get. It is a compromise of the differences between the two bodies, a compromise of the judgments between the Members of the two bodies, and that is what most important legislation is in the last analysis. We have our opinion, the other body has its opinion; we try to get together on them.

With reference to the matter about which the gentleman from Illinois spoke, to recommit the conference report with instructions to the conferees: This will simply tie it up so tight you could not drive a wedge into it. It may be, of course, that you do not care anything about the recess; maybe we should beat our breasts and wave the flag and say: "Let's stay in Washington." I do not feel that way about it. In my judgment the best thing that can be done for the good of this country is to let the men who have been working here days and weeks and months and years get away from this Capital a little and rejuvenate themselves, go back and talk to their constituents a little. I think that is a fine contribution to the war effort, because I see men on the floor of this House—not all of them perhaps, but a great many of them—who are having to work far too hard. It is time we get away from here; we ought to have some concern for getting away from here, and we ought to do it in the interest of the country's business.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I want to say this with reference to the subsidy amendment: That I am opposed to subsidies, but after the vote on yesterday I see no way of preventing subsidies for the time being until the Committee on Banking and Currency can bring in other legislation with reference to that subject.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. TABER. And for that reason my vote today against the motion which the gentleman from Illinois will make will not be because I am in favor of subsidies but because I believe that this is a stop-gap and that we must go along with it until such action as I have indicated can be taken.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is eminently correct. To write that provision in this bill would mean that the bill would come back here without agreement from the other body or if both bodies agreed, it would come back under a veto.

As to O. P. A., the bill as it came from the committee recommended \$165,000,000 for O. P. A., under a unanimous report of the House committee, but the House in its judgment cut that to \$130,000,000. The Senate raised it to \$177,000,000. We compromised the amount at

\$155,000,000. With the \$155,000,000 we shall not be able to give any additional help to the local boards; we shall not be able to carry on the organization even at its present strength, because the \$155,000,000 will be \$5,000,000 less than the annual amount it takes to carry their organization at their present level. So what you are doing is stream-lining O. P. A. to a basis \$5,000,000 under its present level. Personally, I think they can do it; I believe Prentiss Brown will do it, but we must bear in mind the further fact that the committee was notified and the country was notified there were seven additional rationing programs that seemed to be inevitable in the future.

If we are going to have this medium to try to control prices, and to ration commodities that are on the rationing list, then the worst thing that the Congress can do is to refuse to implement it by the necessary personnel to carry it out. I believe the conferees have done the best they could here and in the interest of expediting this legislation and in the interest of getting the money to these agencies that need it, I hope the House will support the conferees who are unanimous, everyone of us, in supporting it, and adopt the conference report.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DIRKSEN moves to recommit the conference report with instructions to the House conferees to insist on House disagreement to Senate amendments Nos. 5, 7, and 8.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am; yes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 42, noes 94.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote, then, on the ground a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously no quorum is present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 99, nays 241, not voting 91, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

YEAS—99

Andersen, H. Carl	Bennett, Mich.	Busbey
Anderson, Calif.	Bennett, Mo.	Cañon, Fla.
Andresen, August H.	Bishop	Carlson, Kans.
Arends	Boren	Carson, Ohio
Barrett	Brehm	Chapfield
	Brown, Ohio	Church
	Buffett	Clevenger

Cole, Mo.
Cox
Cravens
Crawford
Cunningham
Curtis
Day
Dirksen
Dworshak
Ellis
Elston, Ohio
Gathings
Gavin
Gilchrist
Graham
Grant, Ind.
Griffiths
Gross
Gwynne
Hagen
Hale
Harness, Ind.
Heldinger
Hoeven
Hoffman
Hope
Horan

NAYS—241

Abernethy
Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Anderson,
N. Mex.
Andrews
Angell
Arnold
Auchincloss
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Beckworth
Bel
Bender
Blackney
Bland
Bloom
Bolton
Bonner
Bradley, Pa.
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Bulwinkle
Burch, Va.
Burchill, N. Y.
Burdick
Burgin
Butler
Camp
Canfield
Cannon, Mo.
Carter
Case
Celler
Chapman
Chenoweth
Clark
Clason
Coffee
Colmer
Compton
Cooley
Cooper
Courtney
Creal
Crosser
Cullen
D'Alesandro
Davis
Delaney
Dewey
Dies
Dilweg
Dingell
Disney
Ditter
Domeneaux
Dondero
Doughton
Douglas
Durham
Eberharter
Elliott
Ellison, Md.
Ellsworth
Engel
Felghan
Fellows
Fenton
Fernandez
Fisher
Flannagan
Fogarty
Folger
Forand

Marcantonio

Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Rizley
Rockwell
Rodgers, Pa.
Schwabe
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stefan
Stewart
Sumner, Ill.
Talbot
Taile
Tibbott
Vursell
Weichel, Ohio
West
Wheat
Willey
Wilson
Winter
Wolcott
Woodruff, Mich.

Martin, Mass.
May
Morrow
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Mills
Monkiewicz
Monroney
Morrison, La.
Morrison, N. C.
Mott
Mruk
Murdock
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.
Myers
Newsome
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Connor
O'Konski
O'Neal
Outland
Patman
Patton
Peterson, Fla.
Peterson, Ga.
Pfeifer
Poulson
Powers
Price
Priest
Rabaut
Ramey
Ramspeck
Randolph
Rankin
Reece, Tenn.
Richards
Rivers
Robertson
Robinson, Utah
Rogers, Calif.
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Rolph
Rowan
Rowe
Sabath
Sadowski
Sauthoff
Scanlon
Schuetz
Scott
Sheridan
Simpson, Pa.
Slaughter
Smith, Maine
Smith, Va.
Smith, W. Va.
Somers, N. Y.
Sparkman
Spence
Stanley
Starnes, Ala.
Steagall
Stearns, N. H.
Stockman
Sullivan
Taber
Tarver
Taylor
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Towe
Troutman
Voorhis, Calif.

Vorys, Ohio
Waiter
Wasielewski
Weaver
Weiss
Wene

NOT VOTING—91

Baldwin, Md.
Baldwin, N. Y.
Barden
Barry
Bates, Ky.
Boykin
Bradley, Mich.
Buckley
Byrne
Cappozzoli
Cochran
Cole, N. Y.
Costello
Culkin
Curley
Dawson
Dickstein
Drewry
Eaton
Elmer
Fay
Fish
Fitzpatrick
Ford
Fulmer
Furlong
Gallagher
Gerlach
Gifford
Gillie
Green
Hall
Edwin Arthur

Hall
Leonard W.
Hart
Hébert
Heffernan
Hollifield
Izac
Johnson
Calvin D.
Johnson
J. Leroy
Johnson, Ward
Kean
Kennedy
Kilburn
King
Kleberg
Lesinski
McCormack
McKenzie
McMurray
Magnuson
Maloney
Mansfield, Tex.
Mason
Merritt
Miller, Pa.
Nichols
Norton
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.

Wolfenden, Pa.
Wolverton, N. J.
Woodrum, Va.
Wright
Zimmerman

So the motion was rejected.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Gillie for, with Mr. Treadway against.
Mr. Elmer for, with Mr. Gifford against.
Mr. Shafer for, with Mr. Baldwin of New York against.
Mr. Phillips for, with Mr. Vinson of Georgia against.

General pairs:
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Miller of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Schiffer.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Ford with Mr. Pracht.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Kean.
Mr. McMurray with Mr. Calvin D. Johnson.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Gerlach.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Robson of Kentucky.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Sundstrom.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Russell with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Ward with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Cappozzoli with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Barry with Mr. J. Leroy Johnson.
Mr. Tolman with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 2: On page 6, line 9, insert the following:

"No part of any funds appropriated or made available herein to the Board of Economic Warfare shall be used after August 15, 1943, directly or indirectly for the procurement of services, supplies, or equipment outside the United States except for the purpose of executing economic programs or policies formally approved in writing by a majority of the Board and such writing has been filed with the Secretary of State prior to any such expenditure."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 2 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 5 of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "executing" insert the word "general."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 11: On page 19, line 24, insert the following: "Civilian Defense: Not to exceed \$13,359,600 of the unexpended balance of \$100,000,000 contained in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1942, is hereby continued available until June 30, 1944, for the same objects and purposes, including the obligations chargeable to said appropriation, and subject to the same conditions and limitations: *Provided*, That the total amount available for administrative expenses for the fiscal year 1944 shall not exceed \$400,000."

"The appropriations herein made for the Office of Civilian Defense shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation by such agency during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any Federal source."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of said amendment, strike out the figure "\$13,359,600" and insert "\$10,500,000," and in line 8 of said amendment strike out the figure "\$400,000" and insert "\$700,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 24: On page 30, line 15, insert the following: "The appropriation herein made for the Office of War Information shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation by such agency during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 25: On page 30, line 19, insert the following:

"OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION"

"Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of War Mobilization, including salary of the Director at \$15,000 per annum; salaries of two Assistant Directors at \$9,000 per annum each; not to exceed \$30,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, or the civil-service and classification laws; and printing and binding, \$138,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 32: On page 41, line 14, insert the following:

"Sec. 102. On the effective date of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1943, (1) the amounts appropriated in the first, second, and fourth paragraphs under the heading 'Vocational rehabilitation' in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1944, shall be consolidated into one fund and shall be available for carrying out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1943; except that not to exceed \$25,000 shall be available for administrative expenses in providing rehabilitation for disabled residents of the District of Columbia, including printing and binding, travel and subsistence; and (2) the amount appropriated in the fifth paragraph under the heading 'Vocational rehabilitation' in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1944, shall be available for administrative expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1943, and for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the operation of stands in Federal buildings by blind persons, to enlarge the economic opportunities of the blind, and for other purposes,' approved June 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1559, 1560)."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 33 and 34 be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 33: Page 43, line 18, insert the following:

"Sec. 203. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay the salary of any person at the rate of \$4,500 per annum or more unless such person shall have been appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Amendment No. 34: Page 43, line 18, strike out "203" and insert "204."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 33 and 34.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes, at the conclusion of which I shall yield 2 minutes each to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] and then move the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, this is the proposition to require confirmation by the Senate of all persons receiving salaries in excess of \$4,500. Such a provision would hardly be practical at this time for the reason that it would involve minutiae delaying the war effort, particularly if the Congress is in recess during the several weeks immediately ahead of us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment provides that any person receiving any money that is provided for salaries in this bill and receiving a salary over \$4,500 must be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. This provision is so drawn and so worded that it is absolutely impossible of administration. It is so drawn that it would put these agencies all out of business in that every one of those receiving a salary as large as that would be off the rolls until they were nominated and confirmed—a proposition that is absolutely impossible in view of the impending recess of Congress. It would be a dangerous thing to do, and I do not see how the House could join in doing it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], chairman of the Civil Service Committee, which has a bill relating to this subject under consideration.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has passed a general bill dealing with the subject of Senate confirmation. It passed about 2 or 3 weeks ago. I have publicly announced that in due time the House Committee on the Civil Service will give everybody who is interested an opportunity to be heard on the legislation. Certainly we ought not to legislate on such a far-reaching problem as this by a rider on an appropriation bill. I hope the House will vote to insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITE. Do I correctly understand from the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on the Civil Service, that we shall have a chance to vote on this matter at some other day?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia did not give that kind of an assurance. He said that his committee was going to give this matter very thorough consideration. Whether there will be a vote on it the Chair does not know.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk again report the motion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 33 and 34.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If we disagree with the Senate, can we get any legislation at all?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is unable to answer such a question.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 302, nays 29, not voting 99, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

YEAS—302

Abernethy	Dirksen	Jensen
Allen, Ill.	Ditter	Johnson,
Allen, La.	Domengeaux	Anton J.
Andersen,	Dondero	Johnson, Ind.
H. Carl	Doughton	Johnson,
Anderson, Calif.	Douglas	Luther A.
Anderson,	Dworshak	Johnson,
N. Mex.	Elliott	Lyndon B.
Andrews	Ellis	Johnson, Okla.
Angell	Ellison, Md.	Jones
Arends	Ellsworth	Jonkman
Arnold	Elston, Ohio	Judd
Auchincloss	Engel	Kearney
Barrett	Feighan	Kee
Bates, Mass.	Fenton	Keefe
Beall	Fernandez	Keogh
Beckworth	Fisher	Kerr
Bender	Flannagan	Kilday
Bennett, Mich.	Fogarty	Kinzer
Bennett, Mo.	Folger	Kirwan
Bishop	Forand	Klein
Blackney	Fulbright	Knutson
Bloom	Gale	Kunkel
Bolton	Gamble	LaFollette
Brehm	Gavagan	Lambertson
Brooks	Gearhart	Landis
Brown, Ga.	Gibson	Lane
Brown, Ohio	Gilchrist	Lanham
Bryson	Gillette	Larcade
Bulwinkle	Goodwin	Lea
Burchill, N. Y.	Gordon	LeCompte
Burdick	Gore	LeFevre
Burgin	Gorski	Lemke
Busbey	Gossett	Lewis, Ohio
Butler	Graham	Luce
Camp	Granger	Ludlow
Canfield	Grant, Ala.	Lynch
Cannon, Fla.	Grant, Ind.	McCord
Cannon, Mo.	Gregory	McCowan
Carlson, Kans.	Griffiths	McGregor
Carson, Ohio	Gross	McLean
Carter	Gwynne	McMillan
Case	Hagen	McWilliams
Celler	Hale	Maas
Chapman	Halleck	Madden
Chenoweth	Hancock	Mahon
Chipewald	Hare	Manasco
Church	Harless, Ariz.	Mansfield,
Clason	Harness, Ind.	Mont.
Clevenger	Harris, Ark.	Marcantonio
Coffee	Hartley	Martin, Iowa
Cole, Mo.	Hays	Martin, Mass.
Colmer	Hendricks	May
Compton	Herter	Merrrow
Cooley	Hess	Michener
Cooper	Hill	Miller, Conn.
Costello	Hinshaw	Miller, Mo.
Courtney	Hobbs	Miller, Nebr.
Cox	Hoeven	Mills
Cravens	Holmes, Mass.	Monkiewicz
Creal	Holmes, Wash.	Morrison, La.
Crosser	Hope	Morrison, N. C.
Cullen	Horan	Mruk
Cunningham	Howell	Murdoch
Curtis	Hull	Murphy
D'Alesandro	Jackson	Murray, Wis.
Day	Jarman	Newsome
Delaney	Jeffrey	Norman
Dewey	Jenkins	Norrell
Dillweg	Jennings	O'Brien, Mich.
Dingell		O'Connor

O'Neal	Rowe	Taylor
Outland	Sabath	Thomas, Tex.
Patman	Sadowski	Thomason
Patton	Sauthoff	Tibbott
Peterson, Ga.	Schiffler	Towe
Pfeifer	Schuetz	Troutman
Pittenger	Schwabe	Voorhis, Calif.
Ploeser	Scott	Vorys, Ohio
Poulson	Short	Vursell
Powers	Sikes	Wasielewski
Price	Simpson, Ill.	Weaver
Priest	Simpson, Pa.	Welch, Ohio
Rabaut	Slaughter	Welch
Ramey	Smith, Maine	Wene
Ramspeck	Smith, W. Va.	Wheat
Randolph	Smith, Wis.	Whelchel, Ga.
Reece, Tenn.	Somers, N. Y.	Whitten
Reed, Ill.	Sparkman	Whittington
Reed, N. Y.	Spence	Wickersham
Rees, Kans.	Springer	Wigglesworth
Richards	Stanley	Willey
Rivers	Starnes, Ala.	Wilson
Rizley	Stegall	Winstead
Robertson	Stearns, N. H.	Winter
Robinson, Utah	Stefan	Wolcott
Rockwell	Stockman	Wolfenden, Pa.
Rodgers, Pa.	Sullivan	Wolverton, N. J.
Rogers, Calif.	Sumner, Ill.	Woodruff, Mich.
Rogers, Mass.	Taber	Woodrum, Va.
Rohrbough	Talbot	Wright
Rolph	Talle	Zimmerman
Rowan	Tarver	

NAYS—29

Bell	Johnson	Peterson, Fla.
Boren	Calvin D.	Rankin
Bradley, Pa.	Kelley	Scanlon
Crawford	McGehee	Sheridan
Davis	McGranery	Smith, Ohio
Eberhart	Mott	Stewart
Gathings	Mundt	Vincent, Ky.
Heldinger	Murray, Tenn.	Weiss
Hoch	Myers	White
Hoffman	Pace	Worley

NOT VOTING—99

Andresen,	Furlong	Monroney
August H.	Gallagher	Nichols
Baldwin, Md.	Gavin	Norton
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gerlach	O'Brien, Ill.
Barden	Gifford	O'Brien, N. Y.
Barry	Gillie	O'Hara
Bates, Ky.	Green	O'Konski
Bland	Hall	O'Leary
Bonner	Edwin Arthur	O'Toole
Boykin	Hall	Philbin
Bradley, Mich.	Leonard W.	Phillips
Buckley	Hart	Plumley
Buffett	Hébert	Poage
Burch, Va.	Heffernan	Pracht
Byrne	Hollifield	Robison, Ky.
Capozzoli	Izac	Russell
Clark	Johnson,	Sasser
Cochran	J. Leroy	Satterfield
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Ward	Shafer
Culkin	Kean	Sheppard
Curley	Kefauver	Smith, Va.
Dawson	Kennedy	Snyder
Dickstein	Kilburn	Stevenson
Dies	King	Summers, Tex.
Disney	Kleberg	Sundstrom
Drewry	Lesinski	Thomas, N. J.
Durham	McCormack	Tolan
Eaton	McKenzie	Treadway
Elmer	McMurray	Van Zandt
Fay	Maloney	Vinson, Ga.
Fellows	Mansfield, Tex.	Wadsworth
Fish	Mason	Walter
Fitzpatrick	Merritt	Ward
Ford	Miller, Pa.	West
Fulmer		

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.
 Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Eaton.
 Mr. McCormack with Mr. Miller of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Buckley with Mr. Fish.
 Mr. Drewry with Mr. Cole of New York.
 Mr. Byrne with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
 Mrs. Norton with Mr. Kilburn.
 Mr. Fay with Mr. Gillie.
 Mr. Curley with Mr. Gallagher.
 Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
 Mr. Ford with Mr. Pracht.
 Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Kean.
 Mr. McMurray with Mr. Elmer.
 Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Shafer.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Mason.
 Mr. Merritt with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
 Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Gerlach.
 Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Robison of Kentucky.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. O'Hara.
 Mr. Izac with Mr. Stevenson.
 Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Sundstrom.
 Mr. Philbin with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
 Mr. Russell with Mr. Culkin.
 Mr. Ward with Mr. Plumley.
 Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Buffett.
 Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Van Zandt.
 Mr. Tolan with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
 Mr. Barry with Mr. J. Leroy Johnson.
 Mr. Cochran with Mr. Phillips.
 Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Treadway.
 Mr. Bland with Mr. Wadsworth.
 Mr. Barry with Mr. August H. Andresen.
 Mr. West with Mr. Gifford.
 Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Fellows.
 Mr. Walter with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. KELLEY changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. HOCH changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. EBERHARTER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. DAY changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to was laid on the table.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all who have spoken on the two conference reports have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker of the House be authorized to sign the bill H. R. 2714, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, notwithstanding the fact that the House may in the meantime have adjourned before the bill has received the signature of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control;

H. R. 249. An act for the relief of Gertrude Ricketts;

H. R. 1081. An act for the relief of Frank Borah;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of El Paso Electric Co.;

H. R. 1315. An act for the relief of George Henry Bartole and Vernon Wayne Tennyson;

H. R. 1397. An act to authorize the exchange of certain patented lands in the Death Valley National Monument for Government lands in the monument;

H. R. 1557. An act for the relief of Robert H. Pulliam;

H. R. 1602. An act for the relief of Robert N. Bickert;

H. R. 1712. An act for the relief of Sarah Ann Elizabeth Holliday Foxworth and Ethel Allene Brown Haberfeld;

H. R. 2047. An act to correct an error and to confirm, as of March 2, 1861, the title to certain saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to Edward Holden;

H. R. 2038. An act for the relief of John Rhoden;

H. R. 2089. An act for the relief of Jennie Walker;

H. R. 2527. An act to amend the description of the area affected by the act of May 28, 1928, entitled "An act for the relief of the town of Springdale, Utah," and for other purposes;

H. R. 2663. An act to provide a penalty for the willful violation of regulations or orders respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities; and

H. R. 2683. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-seventh anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 19 to 23, inclusive, 1943.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61 to the bill (H. R. 2714) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1134) entitled "An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes."

INDUCTION OF HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1991) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students who have completed more than half of their academic year, with Senate amendments thereto and agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "satisfactorily."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "normal."

Page 2, lines 4 and 5, strike out "perform satisfactorily" and insert "pursue."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "satisfactorily."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman please tell us what these amendments are?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the House bill provided that the students in the last half of year should pursue satisfactorily

their course of training. The word "satisfactorily" was inserted by the House with the idea in view that some boy who might be excused from military service by getting to school would soldier on the job. The Senate struck that out. It leaves it so that if he pursues the course of study at all he may be excused from military service.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. He is supposed to be up in his studies anyway?

Mr. MAY. Yes. It was suggested to me that there were no high schools in the country that do not require the student to study satisfactorily, else he would be kicked out.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is the only change?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SESSION ON MONDAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that there will be a session of the House on Monday next, and that business as usual will be enacted.

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION TO INVESTIGATE IMPROVEMENT OF COLUMBIA RIVER

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 262, which I send to the desk and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make an investigation of the plans for the improvement of the Columbia River and its tributaries for utilization of its waters for reclamation, flood control, navigation, and hydro-electric power generation, and the cost and effect of proposed water storage in Lake Pend Oreille in the State of Idaho.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For purposes of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, by subpoena or otherwise, to take such testimony, and to have such printing and binding done as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "Idaho", insert "and Flathead Lake in the State of Montana."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Irrigation and Recla-

mation. A controversy has arisen between the people of Montana and Idaho with the Bonneville Power Authority over the use to be made of the water resources of the tributaries of the Columbia River. The dispute has been brought to a head by the proposal to leave out beneficial projects, in both Montana and Idaho, and make storage projects in Flathead Lake in Montana and Lake Pend d'Oreille in Idaho. This would destroy large areas of producing farm land and endanger the transportation on the transcontinental railroads crossing the area.

It is proposed to rush these projects through as a war measure when the utilities section of the W. P. B. say they are not necessary and would make a heavy drain on the critical materials needed in war production. After the Rules Committee heard the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE], and others, and no opposition was interposed, we came to the conclusion that we should report the resolution favorably, which action was unanimous.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 262 introduced by the gentleman from Idaho, for the purpose of investigating the facilities from an irrigation and power point of view of Lake Pend Oreille in Idaho and Flathead Lake in Montana. The reason for this proposed investigation is to bring to the attention of the Congress all the facts which can be ascertained about that region, because in recent weeks the Bonneville administration and the Army engineers have shown great interest in those particular localities.

This investigation, I think, is both necessary and worth while and in order to explain my position in this matter I should like to tell the Congress what has been developing in the Flathead region of Montana. About 3 months ago I began to receive letters from various organizations and individuals in that part of my State asking me what truth there was in rumors to the effect that Flathead Lake was to be raised. I inquired among the various Government agencies in Washington which might have an interest in that particular possibility and found out, so I thought, that there was nothing being considered in that area. However, the rumors kept growing, the letters kept increasing, and finally on May 19 a representative of the State of Montana came to Washington for the purpose of meeting with the Army engineers and the Bonneville Power Authority about the possibility of raising the level of Flathead Lake. I attended the meeting with this representative, Mr. Al Winkler, chairman of the Montana Highway Commission, and in attendance also were Dr. Paul Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Authority; Mr. Arthur Goldschmidt, Acting Director of Power;

Gen. Warren T. Hannum and Col. Richard Parks, of the Army engineers; and Senator MURRAY. It was brought out at that meeting definitely and for the first time that the Army engineers had investigated the area around Flathead Lake with the idea of raising its level from 2,893 feet, which is the present height, to 2,910 feet by 1945 and 2,930 feet ultimately. According to General Hannum this was necessary to supply surplus energy for Grand Coulee and Bonneville, and was a wartime necessity.

I pointed out at that meeting that if the proposed raising of Flathead Lake were to go through that it would mean that such towns as Somers, Elmo, Dayton, Big Fork, and parts of Polson and Kalispell, as well as much rich agricultural land and many lake residences, would be inundated. Dr. Raver claimed that it was a good idea to bring about a raising of Flathead Lake so that Montana could develop the power for future industrial development. That may be so; I am not in a position to say because I do not have the necessary technical knowledge, but I felt then, and I feel now, that it would not be wise to put such a program into operation because of the fact that the area which would derive the greatest benefits would be downstream, which areas have expanded tremendously from an industrial point of view since the start of the present conflict. I also pointed out to Dr. Raver that Montana was being drained of much of its natural resources as well as its manpower during the course of the present conflict. I am quite certain from what I said that Dr. Raver and the other assembled gentlemen were aware of my opposition to this proposal, but I felt there was a distinct possibility of this matter being pushed through under the guise of war necessity. This will explain to my colleagues why I have been asking questions about the Flathead when Army appropriations were being considered by this body. However, out of this meeting came an agreement that a hearing would be held by members of the Army engineers and the Bonneville Authority at Helena, the State capital of Montana, on June 1, and at Kalispell, the largest town in the affected area, on June 3. After investigating the matter further and getting what information I could I filed a telegram of protest against the proposed raising of Flathead Lake before the meetings at Helena and at Kalispell. Before and at the time of the Kalispell meeting the people of Montana were distinctly worried and expressions of support of the people of the Flathead against the proposed raising of the lake came from all sections of the State.

Places like Miles City, 600 miles away, Billings, 450 miles away, Great Falls, Butte, Helena, Hamilton, Missoula, and many other cities sent in their protests and also sent delegations. There was not one voice in Montana raised in support of the proposal of the Army Engineers and the Bonneville Authority to raise Flathead Lake, and at the meeting held in Kalispell on June 3, 3,000 people jammed the high-school auditorium and many hundreds more took in the proceedings from the outside by means of

loudspeakers. There was a tenseness in the air which the Federal authorities were well aware of, and at times there were possibilities that the audience would get out of hand. Those people were there representing their homes and the things which they held best in life. They were prepared to fight to the limit of their ability to protect their lake and their valley. They were determined to have the same valley for their sons, who number in excess of 3,000, when they came back from service in the armed forces of the United States. They were determined to save their towns, to preserve their lumber industries, to keep the 50,000 acres of farm land which the lake would inundate if raised, in production. They were united in their opposition, and they made their opposition known in unmistakable terms. The result of this meeting was that the Authority decided to look elsewhere for power development, and on June 7, after we had found out what we could about what had occurred at Kalispell, I called Dr. Raver on the phone and asked him to call a meeting of the advisory board to meet with the Montana congressional delegation the next morning to discuss developments on the Flathead Lake project.

Dr. Raver was very much disinclined to assemble such a meeting, stating that he was leaving town in the afternoon and believed it was an imposition to ask the other members of the board to meet on such short notice due to the fact that "during the war emergency it has been determined that the Flathead project is out." I insisted on the meeting, stating that the matter was of tremendous importance to Montana, to which Dr. Raver replied, "As far as Montana is concerned, they are not going ahead with the project there anyway, so they shouldn't be worried." He further stated that this information "had been cleared with everybody on the advisory board already."

However, since newspaper releases carried the information that work was to begin July 1, I felt that a telephone conversation was not sufficient assurance that the project was called off, and I therefore insisted that the board and the congressional delegation meet together, at which time all the cards could be laid on the table and final disposition made of the proposal. Accordingly, Dr. Raver agreed to a meeting Tuesday, June 8, at 10 o'clock, in his office. At that meeting Senators WHEELER and MURRAY and Congressman O'CONNOR and I met with Dr. Raver and Arthur Goldschmidt, of the Bonneville Advisory Board, and at that conference we were given a copy of the telegram which had been sent to Mr. Marlett, Dr. Raver's executive assistant, and on the basis of that telegram and Dr. Raver's answers to our queries, we notified the press and radio of western Montana as follows:

Senators WHEELER and MURRAY and Congressmen O'CONNOR and MANSFIELD held a conference with Dr. Raver and Arthur Goldschmidt of the Bonneville Advisory Board and were informed by them that because of the loss in lumber, agricultural products, and the disruption of other war activities which would be occasioned by the raising of the waters of the Flathead Lake

the Army Engineers and the Bonneville Advisory Board have concluded that other alternatives for securing additional water necessary for power for war purposes should be explored elsewhere at this time; that the Army Engineers are being requested to hold a public hearing at Lake Pend Oreille for the construction of a low dam at Albeni Falls for the storage of 2,000,000 acre-feet of water. As a result of our conference we feel that the question of raising Flathead Lake as has been proposed is ended. The Montana delegation called attention to the fact that there were power sites on the South Fork and North Fork of the Flathead River which together in their opinion would be ample to provide for the entire run-off of the Flathead Basin. It is our understanding that these projects will be investigated. The delegation also called attention to the possibility of securing additional power at Fort Peck, Canyon Ferry, Little Big Horn, and the Yellowstone River.

BURTON K. WHEELER,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
JAMES F. O'CONNOR,
MIKE MANSFIELD.

We felt the matter had been settled but we kept getting letters from the State about the fears of the people who wanted a definite answer about this project. After concluding the Flathead hearings the authorities decided to hold a public hearing to consider the raising of Lake Pend Oreille. In the meantime I had communicated with Dr. Raver again and asked him a number of questions. I would like at this point, Mr. Speaker, to include a letter which I wrote to Dr. Raver on May 29 and his reply to me of June 12, 9 days after the hearing at Kalispell was concluded:

MAY 29, 1943.

DR. PAUL RAVER,
Administrator, Bonneville Power
Administration,
Department of Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. RAVER: There are a number of questions that have occurred to me in connection with the proposed raising of the level of Flathead Lake, Mont., which I am listing below, and to which I would appreciate your sending me specific and detailed answers at your earliest convenience:

1. What is the cost of power from Grand Coulee now?
2. What is the cost of power from Kerr Dam now?
3. What will the cost of power from Kerr Dam be if the proposed project is completed?
4. With regard to the use of generators at Grand Coulee now, what is the present capacity? How much is utilized? How many more generators are needed?
5. What is the power capacity of Grand Coulee now? What will be its capacity if Flathead Lake is raised to its various proposed levels?
6. What is the status of Lake Pend Oreille at the present time in the matter of power?
7. What is the war necessity for raising Flathead?
8. What compensation will the people receive who will be forced to give up their homes, lands, and businesses?
9. What industrial development will take place in Montana if Flathead is raised?
10. What other possibilities for securing power are there?
11. Why can't Hungry Horse be developed now? If it were, would it not furnish the necessary needed water flow and power? What assurance would we have that it would be developed after the war?

I would be very grateful if I could have the answers to these questions at your very earliest convenience and any additional in-

formation you have with reference to this project.

With best personal wishes,
Sincerely,

MIKE MANSFIELD,
Member of Congress.

JUNE 12, 1943.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: Upon receipt of your letter of May 26, 1943, I forwarded a request to Col. R. Park, Seattle district engineer, Corps of Engineers, War Department, to forward to you such data as he has available. Of course, a considerable amount of information was submitted for the record at the hearings held in Kalispell, Mont., and I believe this record is still in process of preparation.

As you know, this administration markets the power from the Bonneville project and the Grand Coulee project on the Columbia River to various war plants throughout the Pacific Northwest. We have a transmission system of some 2,700 miles of high-voltage lines and stations interconnecting these projects and serving the principal load areas in the region. The Bonneville-Grand Coulee power system is interconnected with all other major utility systems in the States of Oregon and Washington and indirectly with the systems of Montana, Utah, and Idaho.

Early this year joint studies of the War Production Board and this administration indicated the need for providing additional power resources for war production in 1944 and 1945. A program for development of such power resources was considered by the Bonneville Advisory Board at its meeting on March 12-13, 1943, in Washington, D. C. This board, which is composed of representatives of the Secretary of War, Federal Power Commission, Secretary of Agriculture, and Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the provisions of section 2 (a) of the Bonneville Act of 1937, adopted a resolution at its meeting on March 12-13, 1943, embracing a program for development of additional power supplies for war production in 1944 and 1945. A copy of the board's resolution is enclosed.

You will note from paragraph 6 of the resolution that the board recommended that the Corps of Engineers, War Department, in cooperation with engineers of other agencies, undertake an immediate investigation and determine upon an appropriate plan to develop 3,000,000 acre-feet of additional water storage in the headwaters of the Columbia River which can be used for increasing the power output of generators installed and to be installed at the Grand Coulee and Bonneville plants. The board's original resolution designated this water storage to be developed at Lake Pend Oreille. However, when the matter was submitted to the War Production Board we were requested to extend our investigation to include Flathead Lake, Mont., as a possible place for the storage of the additional 3,000,000 acre-feet of water.

The Corps of Engineers, War Department, completed its report and submitted its findings to the Bonneville Advisory Board at a meeting held May 17-19, 1943, in Washington, D. C. In addition to members of the Bonneville Advisory Board being present, representatives of the War Production Board also attended these meetings. After a full consideration of the report submitted by the Corps of Engineers, War Department, which embodied four possible plans for development of the 3,000,000 acre-feet of additional water storage, the Bonneville Advisory Board concluded that the plan requiring the least amount of critical materials, the least amount of time, and consistent with the long-range development of the Columbia River Basin, was that which called for raising the level of Flathead Lake, Mont., by raising the Kerr

Dam at the outlet of this lake some 17 feet initially and 37 feet ultimately. A copy of the Board's resolution adopted on May 19, 1943, recommending this project is enclosed.

Following the Board meeting in Washington, D. C., representatives of the Corps of Engineers, War Department, and of this Administration held a meeting with Gov. Sam C. Ford, of Montana, and his State water-conservation board at Helena, Mont., on June 1, 1943, to discuss the project. A public hearing was then held at Kalispell, Mont., beginning June 3, 1943, and extending through June 5, 1943. As a result of further information developed at the hearings, the Corps of Engineers, War Department, the Bonneville Advisory Board, and the War Production Board have concluded that other alternatives for securing additional power necessary for war purposes should be further explored. In this connection a public hearing will be held on the proposal to store the water at Lake Pend Oreille, Idaho, in the near future. Enclosed is a copy of a telegram forwarded to the Honorable Sam C. Ford, Governor of Montana, on June 7, 1943, containing this information.

Your letter of May 29, 1943, requested information on certain questions. I shall attempt to answer your questions in the order numbered in your letter:

1. No determination of cost of power at Grand Coulee has been made. It will be subject to allocation of cost between power, irrigation, flood control, and navigation.

2. We have no information on cost of power at Kerr Dam.

3. Cost of power at Kerr Dam should be slightly decreased because of increased head on the turbines resulting from raising the dam and because of available water storage to prime up more power. It is presumed that cost of storage in Flathead Lake will be allocated largely to downstream power developments.

4. Present capacity at Grand Coulee, including generating units borrowed from the Shasta project, is 533,900 kilowatts. The average use of generating capacity for the period from August 1, 1942, to February 28, 1943, inclusive, is 91.7 percent. Two generating units borrowed from the Shasta project, having a capacity of 85,000 kilowatts each, have recently been placed in service at Grand Coulee. This additional capacity is rapidly being absorbed by additional war loads, and three additional units rated at 108,000 kilowatts each are needed as soon as they can be manufactured and installed.

5. The prime power capacity at Grand Coulee, after completion of installation of units now under construction, is 680,000 kilowatts. Three million acre-feet at Flathead Lake will increase this to 760,000 kilowatts. Of course, as new generating units are installed, more capacity would become firm power as a result of the water storage. The incremental firm power at Grand Coulee, based upon 3,000,000 acre-feet of storage at Flathead Lake would amount to 172,000 kilowatts upon installation of three more generators at Grand Coulee and would increase further with additional installation of generators and additional water storage. At Bonneville Dam, 3,000,000 acre-feet of water storage would firm up 45,000 kilowatts.

6. The present status of Pend Oreille Lake is natural. No development of storage has been made.

7. The war necessity for raising Flathead Lake is to create storage upstream from Grand Coulee in order to increase the available energy with present installations at Grand Coulee and Bonneville.

8. Compensation for loss of homes, lands, and business will be determined under the usual procedure of right of eminent domain or Federal condemnation proceedings and provisions of the Second War Powers Act.

9. Raising Flathead Lake will have no immediate effect on industrial development in Montana, as no additional power will be made directly available in that region at this time. Additional power can be made available immediately in the region from Grand Coulee by replacement of power transmitted to Montana over Washington Water Power Co. and Montana Power Co. transmission lines. Later, additional power for industrial development can be made available in Montana by installing additional generators at Kerr Dam, constructing the Hungry Horse project and constructing high voltage transmission lines from the Columbia River plants to Montana.

10. Installation of additional units at Grand Coulee and Rock Island and one additional unit at Kerr Dam are possible measures for increasing power supply in the region.

11. The Hungry Horse development will create approximately 500,000 acre-feet of storage, which is inadequate for present requirements, would require excessive use of critical materials, and would require some 2½ to 3 years to construct. The only assurance for post-war construction of this project would be congressional authorization and appropriations.

If there is any additional material you require, please feel free to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL J. RAVEN,
Administrator.

Attached to his letter was a copy of the minutes of the Bonneville Advisory Board of May 19, 1943, and in those minutes is the statement:

Whereas the representatives of the Corps of Engineers, War Department, in cooperation with engineers of other Federal agencies have completed the engineering investigations in accordance with the aforementioned request and have reviewed with the Board their findings and recommendations covering four alternative storage projects found to be feasible, namely: Raising of Kerr Dam at Flathead Lake; construction of Big Rock Dam at Flathead Lake; construction of the Albeni Falls Dam at Lake Pend Oreille to create 2,000,000 acre-feet of storage, combined with raising Flathead Lake 3 feet and lowering the lake outlet 6 feet to provide 1,000,000 additional acre-feet of storage, with a total of 3,000,000 acre-feet for this combination; and construction of Box Canyon Dam on the Pend Oreille River; all of which are completely summarized in "Definite project report for obtaining 3,000,000 acre-feet of storage in Clark Fork Basin, Washington-Idaho-Montana," as prepared by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, under date of May 12, 1943.

The reason I have read this excerpt from the minutes is because of the fact that the proposal to look elsewhere after the Flathead hearings, referred to looking into the possibility of building a low dam at Albeni Falls in Idaho. You will note from the minutes of the Bonneville Advisory Board that the Albeni Falls Dam would create 2,000,000 acre-feet of storage and that with it would be combined an additional 1,000,000 acre-feet of storage through the raising of Flathead Lake 3 feet and lowering the lake outlet 6 feet.

This, of course, could not but arouse the fears of the people in western Montana because we all know the tie-up between the two, based on the advisory board's recommendation. Consequently we felt that we were still in hot water despite the assurances which had been

given to us by the various people whom we had contacted. Even a 3-foot raise in Flathead Lake would inundate some of our towns, destroy much of our agricultural land, and create a precedent by means of which the lake could be raised to a higher level at some future date.

After the Idaho hearings I received copies of papers from home. On the 22d and 23d of June these papers contained front-page articles which state that the Bonneville Administration is still hopeful of raising Flathead Lake and, according to the Daily Missoulian of the latter date, Gov. C. A. Bottolfsen of Idaho had stated that Dr. Raver had advised the gentleman from Idaho, Congressman WHITE, that because of the War Production Board's disapproval of the Albeni Falls project wartime development would be limited to increased storage of water in Flathead Lake.

I am sorry that time does not allow me to go into more detail. I hope I have drawn a fairly comprehensive picture as this matter exists in my State. I want to say again, as I have many times in the past, that I am unalterably opposed to any proposition to raise the level of the largest inland fresh-water lake in the United States. I want to call to the attention of the Congress that if the raising of Flathead is allowed to go through, it will directly affect 25,000 people, and indirectly 50,000, or one-tenth of the population in my State. The rights of the tribe of Flathead Indians who live in this region will also be involved.

We know that critical materials are being produced in that region and we must recognize the fact that the large lumber industry in that area, as well as the thousands of acres of productive agricultural land are just as important and just as vital to the furtherance of the war effort as any other factors one can bring out. We are going to face hard times in this country from the standpoint of food and to me it would be folly to take this acreage out of production at this time. There are other sites which could be developed: the Hungry Horse, of the south fork of the Flathead; the Cabinet Gorge on the Idaho-Montana line; the West Robinson Dam up in British Columbia, as well as many more which could be constructed with perhaps more critical material but certainly with a less devastating effect upon the western part of Montana. There are a good many things that we have to consider but to me the human equation is of paramount importance. I want these towns to continue to grow and prosper. I want these lands to continue to produce. I want these farms to continue to yield for the benefit of our Nation, and I want these people who have made their homes in the western part of our State to be assured of the security which is theirs by right, I want their sons and daughters serving in the armed forces of the United States to come back to that valley and to enjoy its fruits and its splendors. I want to see that scenic area, the most beautiful in the United States, kept intact not only for the people of the State of Montana but for the people of all the United States. I want to see this fear and worry dissipated

and definite assurance given to these people that no action is contemplated or will be taken by the Bonneville Administration or the Army engineers to raise our lake and to create a condition which will cause nothing but dissension, chaos, and unrest. This uncertainty, this threat implied because of a lack of a definitive statement from Washington, has already stopped development, not only on property directly affected but that indirectly as well. Business has practically stopped except for the barest necessities of life. The sooner a clear-cut statement is forthcoming as to future policies and guaranties that no changes will be made the better it will be for all concerned. The successive rising-stage program spells ruin for thousands and severe financial losses to many more and would drive the present residents of Lake and Flathead Counties to the tops of the mountains or else out of the country and destroy their confidence in our Government at a time that it is badly needed. Because of these factors, and I believe in them with my whole heart and soul, I urge the Congress to authorize this committee to look into this matter so that our way of life and our homes will be preserved for us and this uncertainty done away with, once and for all.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, a controversy has arisen between the people of Montana and Idaho with the Bonneville Power Authority over the best use to be made of the water resources of the tributaries of the Columbia River. The dispute has been intensified by the proposal to leave out beneficial projects in both Montana and Idaho, and make storage projects in Flathead Lake in Montana and Lake Pend Oreille in Idaho, thereby destroying large areas of producing farm land endangering the transportation on the transcontinental railroads crossing the area. It is proposed to rush these projects through as a war measure when the utilities section of the W. P. B. say they are not necessary and would make a heavy drain on the critical materials needed in war production.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I am much pleased with the House's action on this resolution. I am a member of the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee who unanimously passed this resolution, and I was one of those who appeared before the Rules Committee on its behalf.

One of the things which we lack is a Federal policy that provided for the settling of disputes between States over controversies arising in the development of rivers that flow over, through, or between one or more States on their way from mountainous watersheds to the sea.

This is a matter that not only permits, but demands a Federal and intrastate interest. It is a proper concern and function of the Congress. We all recall the southwestern conflict that raged for a while over the development of the Colorado River. Some headway was made last winter when the Republic River compact was achieved between the States of Kansas, Nebraska, and Colorado.

Now, we find differences arising between the States of Montana, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon, over the complete and orderly development of the Columbia River. It is to be sincerely hoped that this committee can make some contribution toward the achieving of a compact and aid in the progress of evolving a Federal pattern that may, in the future, anticipate these interstate disputes and dissolve these differences as they arise.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House passed a resolution which was approved by the Rules Committee and likewise by the House providing for the appointment by the Chairman of a special committee of the Irrigation Committee to investigate the proposal to raise the level of Flathead Lake in Montana by raising the height of what is known as the Kerr Dam. The attempt to raise Flathead Lake is clearly an attempted violation of the sovereignty of the great State of Montana and we are all proud of the manner in which our Montana people resisted such an unheard-of effort to invade and destroy the rights and property of the people of Montana.

Apparently it was of little consequence to those responsible for that idea that hundreds and hundreds of homes would be destroyed; that the beautiful city of Kalispell would be isolated if not inundated; that some 50,000 acres of the most fertile farm land in America would be inundated; that lumber mills and millions of feet of valuable timber would be forever and irreplaceably lost; that the scenic wonderfulness of Flathead Lake, a great national asset and beauty spot, would be seriously marred; and that the cost to the State of Montana in property loss, resources lost, highway replacement costs, plus the cost of litigation involved would be tremendous and staggering to the imagination. And all for what purpose? As I have said, and now say again, simply to take from the State of Montana one of its greatest natural assets for the benefit of another State.

Nor should the fact be overlooked that the Flathead Indians would also stand to suffer greatly by such a transaction, and I think all will agree that the Indian has been treated shabbily enough in the past without this further thrusting of the Indian down the economic scale. What is known as the Kerr Dam was constructed on the Flathead Indian Reservation. The Montana Power Co. pays a royalty to the Indians of \$175,000 per annum for the use of the Indian property. Should the Government take this dam the Indians would be deprived of this royalty unless compensation was secured from the Congress of the United States, and in view of past experience in

getting appropriations for Indians I would say that it would be a man's job to secure this compensation.

Nor do I think we should overlook the fact that no less than 70,000,000 board feet of lumber is produced annually in this section, which production gives employment to about 750 persons and that pay rolls, and so forth, totaled almost \$3,000,000 in 1942.

The people of the northwest section cannot understand why the Bonneville Power Administration and the Army Engineers instead of endeavoring to make a storage reservoir out of Flathead Lake, did not look to Fort Peck. A world of power could be developed at Fort Peck if power generators were secured for the latter place. The development of additional power at Fort Peck could be had at very little cost. We of Montana cannot understand why, if additional power is needed in the Northwest, Fort Peck is being overlooked.

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 285), which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 262, incurred by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$5,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts and legal, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order next week for the House to consider conference reports on the same day reported, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXVIII.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the New York Times on the cost of subsidies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on how the recent coal strike appeared to the soldiers in north Africa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of Ohio was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my

remarks in the Appendix and include therein a letter from the officers and crew of the *Booker T. Washington*.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement by the senator from Puerto Rico, Hon. Vicente Geigel-Polanco.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HAGEN was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record in two places—in one to include an editorial, and in the other an outline of victory garden program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the Providence Evening Bulletin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial by Mr. David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars on the transportation problem.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made this afternoon and to include therein a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the other special orders I may address the House today for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the Wall Street Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include two short resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes and at the conclusion

of my remarks to include a joint letter from the Secretaries of War and Navy addressed to the President of the United States on February 8, and also a letter from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, signed by Admiral Leahy, addressed to the Secretary of the Navy on February 1, with a suggested Executive order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEFENSE OF OUR LIBERTIES

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for a few minutes about the defense of our liberties—not by our armed forces abroad but by ourselves at home.

I think we have no right to send men out to fight and to die for liberty if we are not ready at least to speak for liberty at home when it is in danger.

The decision of the Supreme Court on May 10, in connection with radio broadcasting, has done something to one of our liberties. Either it has begun to destroy a specific part of American liberty or it has redefined the word until it has no meaning for true Americans. Look at our United States Supreme Court today and you will know why Jesus wept.

If we are honest with ourselves, we will all admit that our liberties have been jeopardized. Some of us think the danger is serious, others are complacent. But no one in this Chamber believes that our solicitude for freedom is, in the elegant words of the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, "hokey." Mr. Fly, as Chairman of the F. C. C., has been authorized by the Supreme Court to take charge of all radio programs in the United States. There is, to be sure, a statute which forbids Mr. Fly to interfere with the services and the pleasures which radio brings to the American people. But the Supreme Court has explained the law away. It has gone beyond Mr. Fly's bid for power over the business of broadcasting and has given him and the Communications Commission, supreme and unlimited power over programs as well.

We are in the midst of a war for liberty. If I were to inform this body that a company, a battalion, or a regiment had been lost unnecessarily—by ignorance or neglect—every Member, regardless of party, would cry out for court martial of the guilty, or for impeachment. By the Supreme Court decision we have lost more than a battalion of fighters for liberty. We have begun to lose what we fight for—since you cannot lose one civil right without endangering all civil liberty. And there is no one to impeach for ignorance and neglect—no one except ourselves. In the miserable loophole left—the almost invisible loophole through which a tiny ray of light still shines—the Court itself has challenged us, saying that "the responsibility belongs to the Congress." All we are guilty of is not taking our responsibility—and acting wisely upon it.

I do not know whether all of you have read the decision of May 10. Perhaps the headlines repeated the old words about the Court curbing the networks.

Curbing has become a friendly word—almost like checking abuses—not at all like destroying freedom. Perhaps you have thought it only natural that the networks should protest—after all, they lost the decision. Perhaps you have heard many times that Congress meant the F. C. C. to be something more than a traffic officer of the radio waves. The sharp outlines of objects are dulled by familiarity—we hear a phrase so often that it ceases to have meaning. And when five members of the Court deliver a decision we assume that all is right with the world. It does not seem possible that in the midst of a war to bring freedom to the world one of our own basic freedoms should be destroyed. It hardly seems necessary to worry about it. Mr. Fly would be glad if we did not worry about freedom. The fuss about freedom is all "hokey," says Mr. Fly. Maybe it is, to him. Maybe freedom is also "hokey." But millions of men and women are in the armed services of this country, and many of them will die—at this very moment some of them are dying—for freedom. We have the right to be concerned.

Is it true that the Federal Communications Commission has been given authority over radio programs? Can the Commission actually prevent a radio station from putting on a comedian whose humor it does not appreciate? Or a commentator whose philosophy it does not share? It seems improbable. But it is so.

Let me go back to the business of the traffic cop. You may know that before 1927 there was a totally unregulated scramble for the air waves, one station overlapped another and broadcasting might have been destroyed if some traffic regulations had not been put into force. These regulations were not made for the benefit of the broadcasters. They were set up for the advantage of the American people—and Congress imposed regulation of the traffic in accordance with public interest, convenience, and necessity.

The five judges who gave the May 10 decision say that the act of Congress "does not restrict the Commission merely to supervision of the traffic." The act, says the Court, "puts upon the Commission the burden of determining the composition of that traffic."

You and I, Mr. Speaker, are not familiar with the intricate problems of broadcasting, but we do know about traffic officers. And we know what English words mean. Let us, then, imagine that we have been made special traffic officers in the meaning of the Supreme Court's decision.

We do not merely see to it that east-west traffic moves on a green light, while north-south stands still on red. We are not restricted to preventing speed maniacs from cutting out of line, jamming ahead of other drivers into wrong lanes of traffic. No. The Supreme Court says to us "You are now a Federal bureau. You are to have the burden of determining the composition of the traffic."

So, as good Federal bureaucrats we do nothing openly at first—we let common people drive blue cars or green ones,

limousines or roadsters—but on the side we confine station wagons to truck roads. Then we announce that only 10 percent of the commercial vehicles owned by one company may operate on one day. We deny driving licenses to women drivers, we refuse the road to cars bought on the installment plan, and finally we get tired of all these half measures and determine the composition of the traffic once for all—we drive all privately owned vehicles off the road entirely.

It sounds preposterous. But apply it to radio. The F. C. C. is authorized to decide what radio shall be. It may begin by changing the business methods of the stations—but it has the power to go farther—and power never lies around unused. Mr. Fly, it is reported, is satisfied with his victory over American broadcasting. His appetite for dictating the composition of the programs may be dormant. But the power is there. This month and next, nothing may change. But if a station thinks the people in its neighborhood want comedy at night and the F. C. C. thinks the people ought to have lectures—the F. C. C. has the last word. The comedian will be kept off the highways of the air. If a woman commentator disagrees with someone's policy on regimenting women, the woman—or the station on which she appears—will be warned and, by one means or another, will be shunted off the air. And as the appetite for tyranny grows, someone, today's F. C. C. or its successor tomorrow, will also determine the traffic for good and all, and we will have no private radio—which means no free radio.

That sounds ominous. To a minority of the Supreme Court it seems even lacking in common sense. If the Congress meant to interfere with the business arrangements of the highways—not to mention the composition of the traffic—it would have said so. The minority says with some irony that "the subject is one of such scope and importance as to warrant explicit mention." But, of course, Congress did not mean to let any traffic officer determine the composition of the traffic—not on the highway—and not on the air waves.

If the American people were informed today that after the war a Federal agency will tell them what size and color and type of car to buy, they would march on Washington and demand, from us, redress of grievances. We are a long-suffering people, but we are not so stupid as to let all our freedom go by default. Why is it, then, that our folks at home have not protested against destruction of their liberty to hear whatever they want on the air?

I hope we will not delude ourselves, gentlemen, into thinking the people do not care. They care intensely. For 20 years American radio has given the American people a greater range, a finer standard, of information and entertainment than any other people of the world has enjoyed—and this has been done without taxing the people, without propagandizing the people. In short, it has been American—and it has been free. The lives of millions of us are in an orbit which radio touches—in important

ways—at every hour of the day, from the moment it gives us crop information in the morning through the news of the day, the music and the plays and the war messages of the evening to the music which sends us to sleep at night.

No one can tamper with the legitimate entertainment of a democratic people and survive. The reason we have not been denounced is that the American people do not know what has happened. They are not interested in networks and affiliated stations. They are interested in programs, in Fibber McGee and Fred Allen, in Raymond Gram Swing and Toscanini and the Man Behind the Gun. They do not know that these are threatened. They imagine that some complicated contracts between networks and stations will be altered. They have not been told that the composition of the traffic will be determined in Washington by the Federal Communications Commission. And if they have heard that the networks can find no defense against this tyranny, they have also heard Mr. Fly say "hooey."

I do not know how you can be too solicitous of liberty. If you think liberty was created, once for all, in 1776, and all we have to do is enjoy it, then you may retire into your cave and wait until the war is over and other men have fought and died for liberty. For liberty is like our daily bread, and is our daily bread, because we live by it, and it must be created again and again, and watched over and protected. And in defense of liberty we who do not run the risk of death in action have an obligation to those who do. We must see to it that liberty is not diminished when they return.

I challenge Mr. Fly to say to our armed services that while they were away he has taken radio away from the people. Let him tell them that he will decide what the composition of the radio traffic will be when they get back, and if they will politely petition him to let them hear Jack Benny or Invitation to Learning, he and the F. C. C. will listen to their request, and grant it if they happen to feel so inclined. For the court says the commissioners have expansive powers. The court places no restriction upon them.

But we—as part of the Congress of the United States—we can restrict the Commission. We can restore freedom to radio under the regulations and restrictions we have always imposed.

We must not let the defense of American liberty fall into the hands of one party. We must not, by default, let ourselves become the party of its enemies. If we do not fight, if we are silent, we are betraying liberty, and it shall not be forgiven us.

The liberty of a people is made up of many things—some great, some trifling. And the attack upon liberty always begins with the little things, those hardly worth fighting for. The attack on free radio is almost invisible now; it is concealed under legal terms. It seems concerned only with insignificant business details.

But the stake is a great one; it is even greater than the people's rights in radio. The stake is freedom.

An outpost has been taken. If we react promptly we can throw the enemy back and punish him for his arrogance. We have the weapons, it is our right to make laws, to define powers, to protect liberty. I hope we will have the courage and intelligence to do our duty.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Does not the gentleman think that under the decision of the Supreme Court, to which he has referred, it is possible for the Federal Communications Commission to deny to any political party the right to use the airways?

Mr. SHORT. Of course, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio is one of the ablest lawyers in this House and I am neither a lawyer nor the son of a lawyer, but I can, I think, understand fairly well the English language. The gentleman almost answers his own question. I think it has such broad and expansive powers that it could do that very thing.

The Court has shown us the way. We have the solemn obligation of writing a law so clear that it will forever do away with the shabby generalizations by which authority is usurped. In place of "the composition of the traffic" we can write the exact phrases by which the powers of the F. C. C. will be described. If we want to protect liberty in America, we must make the laws precise and practical, by which radio can continue to function as one of the most powerful engines of democracy ever invented by the mind of man.

JOINT LETTER OF THE SECRETARIES OF WAR AND NAVY TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 8, 1943.

The President,

The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We join with the United States Chiefs of Staff in recommending that you promulgate the attached Executive order transferring from the Federal Communications Commission to the Department of War certain radio intelligence functions.

Through radio intelligence activities, the military forces of the United States and our allies obtain military information of the utmost importance. Radio intelligence is an important military weapon.

Participation by the Federal Communications Commission in radio intelligence should be discontinued, because:

Since radio intelligence develops information as to the movements and dispositions of the enemy, it is essential, for reasons of coordination and security, that there be full military control;

Since the responsibility for military action rests with the armed forces, the responsibility for obtaining the technical information governing that action must also be in the armed forces;

Military activities have been hampered by severe shortages of trained personnel and critical equipment essential to radio intelligence.

The Secretary of the Navy, on September 11, 1942, requested the Joint Chiefs of Staff to

study the problem of responsibility and security of radio intelligence. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have made a thorough and comprehensive study, and their response (based on that study) is attached hereto. They, as well as the responsible military commanders in the field, are of the belief that radio intelligence, the location of clandestine stations, the supervision of military communications security and related activities must, in their very nature, be under the sole control of the military forces.

Enclosed herewith is a copy of a letter from Admiral Leahy recommending this action.

Yours respectfully,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.
FRANK KNOX,
Secretary of the Navy.

THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
Washington, February 1, 1943.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In response to your memorandum to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, dated September 11, 1942, on the subject of responsibility for the conduct of security of military communications activities, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have had made a thorough and comprehensive study of the problems referred to therein in which full consideration has been given to the views of the military and naval commanders in the field who are charged with responsibility for military action based on radio intelligence. A summary of the findings is given in the following paragraphs.

In general, radio intelligence is the method of determining the enemy's plans and dispositions through observation of his radio communications. The facilities used for this are also used to assist our own forces through monitoring of communications channels to enforce security standards and to render assistance to our own craft.

Both the Army and Navy are engaged in radio intelligence and related activities. In addition, the Federal Communications Commission has set up an elaborate system of its own which is engaged in:

- (a) The location of enemy units at sea and abroad;
- (b) The interception of enemy army, navy, and diplomatic traffic;
- (c) The location of clandestine stations;
- (d) The giving of bearing aids to lost planes;
- (e) The maintenance of a "marine watch" at distress frequencies; and
- (f) The monitoring of military radio circuits.

These activities of the Federal Communications Commission are constantly expanding and are a substantial drain upon available material and personnel.

Radio intelligence activities of the Federal Communications Commission tend to be less and less useful as the art progresses. This is due to integration into proper radio-intelligence systems of large quantities of secret military information accumulated through special processes by the armed forces, including exchanges of military information with our allies, knowledge of present and proposed disposition of forces, and other special information which for obvious reasons cannot be disseminated to an agency such as the Federal Communications Commission. Moreover, information obtained by the Federal Communications Commission through its own radio-intelligence activities is not, in the military sense, secure, due to inherent tendencies toward publicity of Federal Communications Commission activities, use of non-secure methods of reporting and correlation, and the necessarily close relationship of Federal Communications Commission military-intelligence activity with other phases of the agency's work.

Because of the essential differences between military and Federal Communications Commission standards and methods it has not been possible to integrate their information, with the result that the attempted duplication by the Federal Communications Commission of work that is being more effectively done by the military has in fact endangered the effectiveness and security of military radio intelligence.

In view of the foregoing it is concluded that the better prosecution of the war will be served by terminating all military and quasimilitary radio-intelligence activities of the Federal Communications Commission and confining such activities to the Army and Navy.

Since the Army's present need for personnel and equipment in the field of radio intelligence is greater than that of the Navy, all of the radio-intelligence facilities of the Federal Communications Commission should forthwith be transferred to the Army entirely. The personnel of the Federal Communications Commission heretofore engaged in radio intelligence should be made available initially as civilian employees of the Army, pending decision by the Army as to which shall be placed in military status, which replaced by military personnel and which would be best retained in the Army as civilian employees.

The foregoing conclusions are supported by the views of the Army and Navy commanders in the field who are charged with responsibility for military action based on radio intelligence.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, therefore, request the Secretaries of War and Navy to join in a recommendation to the President that he transfer to the Army personnel and equipment now used by the Federal Communications Commission in the field of radio intelligence. A proposed Executive order is enclosed.

From the standpoint of the present problem, the promulgation of this Executive order would leave the Federal Communications Commission in the radio field, with the responsibility for monitoring, processing, and disseminating foreign voice, news, and propaganda broadcasts (its Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service), the monitoring and inspection of stations licensed under the Communications Act of 1934, all necessary licensing procedures, including revocation and suspension, and the institution of prosecutions of licensed stations and operators for violations of treaty, statute, or regulations.

The Army and Navy (in accordance with divisions of function between themselves) would have full and exclusive responsibility for the conduct of military radio intelligence as described in the present report.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM D. LEAHY,
Admiral, United States Navy, Chief
of Staff to the Commander in Chief
of the Army and Navy, for the
Joint Chiefs of Staff.

EXECUTIVE ORDER TRANSFERRING RADIO INTELLIGENCE FUNCTIONS TO THE WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

By virtue of the authority vested in me by Title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, approved December 18, 1941, as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. All functions, powers, and duties of the Federal Communications Commission in the field of radio intelligence and, particularly, in the conduct of direction-finding activities; the location of enemy radio transmissions abroad and at sea; the interception of radio traffic of foreign countries (excluding voice broadcasting); the detection, location, and suppression of clandestine or illegal stations both abroad and within the limits of the United States, its Territories and posses-

sions, and the areas occupied by its armed forces; the giving of radio and direction-finding navigational aids to vessels and aircraft; the monitoring of United States Army and Navy communications circuits and the maintenance of distress frequency watches, are transferred to the Departments of War and Navy in accordance with distribution of functions established between them.

2. All records and property (including radio transmitting and receiving equipment) and all personnel of the Federal Communications Commission used primarily in the performance and administration of the functions transferred by this order are transferred to the War Department for use in the performance and administration of functions transferred by this order; but any personnel so transferred who are found by the War Department to be in excess of the personnel necessary for the performance and administration of such functions, powers, and duties shall be retransferred under existing law to other positions in the Government or separated from the service. So far as possible, personnel transferred who are found qualified therefor shall be placed in a military status.

3. So much of the unexpended balance of the appropriations or other funds available, including those available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, to the Federal Communications Commission in the exercise of functions transferred by this order as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with the approval of the President, shall determine, shall be transferred to the War Department for use in connection with the exercise of functions so transferred. In determining the amount to be transferred the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may include an amount to provide for the liquidations of obligations incurred against such appropriations or other funds prior to the transfer.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 1943.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FOOD SUBSIDIES AS AFFECTING THE CATTLE GROWER AND THE FARMER

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address my remarks of opposition to a roll-back-subsidy law.

During the few months that I have been privileged to be a Member of this great body much has been said about the problem of the farmer, but much needs to be said about his problem, and much needs to be done about it—wisely done.

The question of the so-called roll-back-subsidy meat program also has engaged the attention of this body on a number of occasions. It is almost presumptuous to attempt to add anything concerning it to that which has been said. But I feel impelled to speak to the issue a few minutes on behalf of the men and women and boys and girls whom I represent and whose interests have not been brought specifically to the attention of the Congress.

In a very real sense the fate of this Nation and of the world depends upon the American farmer. From his efforts and devotion to duty must come the food and clothing for our armed forces, for our war workers, for our civilian population in every walk of life. From the land that he tills must come many of the products which are needed to keep our munitions plants and war factories operating, to speed the day of our victory,

From the storehouses which he fills must go out the foodstuffs to sustain the whole world, our allies, the soon-to-be-liberated peoples of Europe, and the East and, yes, to our enemies when they have laid down the sword. America is the arsenal for democracy. The American farmer is the world's hope against the stalking specter of famine.

The American farmers have been challenged as no group was ever challenged in history. With less manpower, with very much less farm machinery and scarce supplies of every kind, with acute shortages of feeds and fertilizers, in the face of unfavorable elements he has been called upon to produce more than ever has been produced anywhere, any time. Our experts tell us that we shall perhaps not reach the food goals set for the year. If this be true the fault is not the farmers'. The effort of our farmers to discharge their awful responsibility since this Nation entered the war has honored their calling for all time to come.

A famous American once said: "Burn down your cities and leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic; but destroy our farms and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in the land." In this hour when many cities of the world are in smoking ruins, when agony and disease and famine hang over the globe like a pall, and civilization is pushed back almost to the Dark Ages by the military dreams of madmen, our farmers hold a very large part of our hope for success in this war of liberation, and of our hope for the peace which will follow.

Yes; the American farmer has done his part. He is doing his part now. What have we, his Government, his chosen representatives in Congress, done to assist him? What incentive have we given him to spur his efforts?

The losses of perhaps 8,000,000 acres of crops from destructive rains and overflow in large areas of the Corn Belt cannot be made good at this late hour. The Corn Belt has its optimum time of planting not only corn but sorghums, millet, garden vegetables, and other food crops. I cannot conceive that the enthusiasm of our farmers is as high as it was. They are rapidly becoming disillusioned as a result of the continued bugling of the farm-labor situation and the disparity between fixed costs and the prices their finished products bring them. Nor are city people rushing to the nearby fields en masse to help save the farmers' crops. He is largely left to his own resources.

And now there has come to plague him this so-called roll-back subsidy program. Every livestock grower in this Nation, big or little, is opposed to it. Every livestock grower, big or little, has been injured by it. The evil effects of this proposed plan are not speculative. They can be demonstrated.

The farmer is asked to produce meat at less than the cost of production. Those who favor the subsidy contend that the subsidy payments to the processor will guarantee to the farmer that he will be paid a price for meat which will insure a reasonable profit. But the facts speak for themselves. Even should the plan work beyond the fondest dream of its

sponsors the subsidies would be inadequate. The loss to the producer already, due to the effect on the market caused by the confusion of multiple plans and regulations, has reached a sum of from twenty to thirty dollars an animal. The facts speak for themselves. The livestock markets over the length and breadth of this Nation have collapsed. The armed forces as well as civilians are faced with dire shortages of meat, particularly beef.

On Wednesday, June 16, in the city of Chicago, cattle arriving at 20 leading livestock centers totaled 29,000 head, the smallest for June in the last 15 years. Receipts for the corresponding day last year were 51,000 head. And the situation in Chicago is typical of a Nation-wide situation. Market operations in my own State are paralyzed. It is so with my neighboring States. On a recent day there were but a scant 700 animals offered on the great market at Fort Worth, Tex.

Price-ceiling experiments tracing back to the Roman Empire have a record of uninterrupted failure as a method of preventing inflation or keeping down the cost of living.

Inflation should be attacked on two fronts, first by adopting policies that will result in the greatest possible food production, thus increasing supplies, and second, by syphoning off buying power through taxation, thus reducing the demand.

No industry stands alone in wartime or at any other time. All are interrelated and interdependent. It is folly to expect farmers to produce at a loss for the benefit of consumers, and subsidizing is not an answer to the problem. It is a scheme which is basically unsound and un-American.

As I understand, the estimated cost of the subsidies will be billions of dollars. The maximum saving to consumers is estimated at only millions of dollars—on the basis of average civilian meat allowances and average roll-backs per pound. This taxation will be paid in large part by the farmers, the owners of land. When the Government decides to crack down on inflation and hold the line they crack down on the farmer, granting to other groups concessions unparalleled in economic history.

Farm labor will continue to go to the war plants until a sufficient inducement is given them to remain and work on the farms. This is, of course, true of the livestock growers and their labor.

In my district there is located a vast naval armament plant. There the workers are paid \$5 to \$25 a day. The average earning of the farmer of my district is scarcely \$2.50 a day. The result of this inequality is obvious. Labor from the farms and ranches will flock to this plant and similar defense plants to seek the greater financial reward.

The meat program has been very confusing to the growers. In April the packers industry, together with livestock men, formed a meat council of 101 associations to consider price-and-supply conditions. The outcome of their recommendations was creation in May of a 12-man War Meat Board composed of representatives of the armed forces, the War Food Ad-

ministration, and the O. P. A., with meat packers serving as consultants.

Before this new meat board could start work, the O. P. A. ignored demands of the meat industry to give the board a chance and ordered meat prices rolled back 10 percent on June 21. There can be no question but that the subsidy would hamper the meat board in its job of managing the wartime meat supply from day to day so as to keep demand and supply in balance.

I submit to you that what we need in the meat program is every inducement to the increasing of the meat supplies—to increased production of livestock. We have paid premiums to labor in the form of wage increases again and again during this war period because we wanted to get the various jobs of manufacturing and construction done in the shortest possible time and in the best possible way. We shall have to do the same thing for the farmer and the livestock grower and in the meat industry. We do not need subsidies. We do need better controls over shipments of livestock to markets and improvement of allocation of available supplies. We do need, and I repeat it, every possible inducement and stimulation to increased production.

So much has been said here, so much has appeared in the Nation's press, the condition is so generally understood, that there is little I can add about the terrible menace of the black market. But very surely this subsidy plan would further divert the supply of the Nation's meat into these illegal channels.

Conservative estimates place at more than 20 percent the amount of the Nation's meat which flows into and through this black-market channel. These "meatleggers" take their trucks direct to the farm and buy every available animal. Delivery is made at night and they slaughter where they may, regardless of sanitation and menace to health—by the road, in the woods, in dirty barns and sheds. The black market in meat not only disrupts the effort to distribute available supplies but constitutes a menace of the gravest degree to our Nation's health.

Price ceilings and subsidies on meat simply cannot solve the black-market problem. The experience of this Nation with alcohol in the prohibition era attests the fact. When the American people want something badly enough, it will be supplied them at a price. There is an enormous appetite for meat in this country. Packers estimate they could sell 20,000,000,000 pounds this year if they could get it. The public demands the meat and it will not be supplied them at less than the cost of production. No matter how many laws are passed or how many directives are issued and regulations promulgated, the price of a much-desired product cannot be beaten down below the cost of production by Government enforcement agencies or official fiat.

But I will leave the economics and the theories of this new attempt to solve the food problem to the professors. I personally am greatly concerned with the ill effect of this subsidy program in my own State and in my own district. The

farmers and livestock growers that I represent are, for the most part, the little men of the business. When these Government experts publish their imposing statistics my people are found in the lower brackets of operations and income. These are the people of the rocky barren mountain farms and ranches, the 1-room homes, the ill-clad, ill-fed, and underprivileged families—the stricken people of depression days. They deserve the plaudits of all who love mankind for the courage and determination which enabled them to survive that dreadful period. They have come back a little way now from those dark days. They begin to find the going underfoot a little firmer. They hope and plan for a slightly better world for themselves and, particularly, for their children. They are among the stanchest citizens of our country. From their ranks come the best citizens, the bravest soldiers. I will match their patriotism against that of any people in the world.

They are toll-worn men, men who have had little pleasure in life. They have seen only hard work and very little return. Life holds little else for them. Their hope is for their children. In Oklahoma and in my district the Future Farmers of America and the 4-H Clubs are the two great organizations which are devoted to preparing and assisting the children of my people to enter upon the more tolerable and abundant life which their parents have not known.

Only in this generation has the educational principle, "We learn to do by doing," been effectively employed in the teaching of agriculture in our public-school system. Establishment of the teaching of vocational agriculture in the common schools came with the enactment by Congress of the Smith-Hughes bill, extending financial aid in that undertaking.

The establishment of vocational teaching of agriculture in our consolidated schools and rural high schools opened a new era in the agricultural development of America. Under it was formed the voluntary farm boys' organization known as the Future Farmers of America.

F. F. A. chapters now have some 10,000 boys enrolled in the State of Oklahoma. These boys actually learn by doing. They have more than three-quarters of a million dollars of their own money invested in livestock, crops, machinery, buildings, and other equipment in the State. They learn to farm by farming, under direction of trained instructors. Approximately 50,000 Oklahoma boys have passed through the F. F. A. chapters of the State to adult age. More than 96 percent of Oklahoma boys studying vocational agriculture in the common school system voluntarily became members of the Future Farmers of America.

In regional and national competition, Oklahoma F. F. A. boys have taken an unusual share of honors. Repeatedly, they have shown themselves masters of the business of farming and stock raising. Proudly we greet the annual return of groups of F. F. A. boys bringing home trophies of their contests in the arenas of America. I honor this fine organization of farm youth, and pay trib-

ute to them and to their leaders for their earnest application to their chosen work, and for the outstanding results they have achieved. We recognize in them the leadership of tomorrow in agriculture and livestock culture. I congratulate them upon, not only their achievements in competition, but also upon the astonishing unfolding of their personalities which accompanies their studies and practices in F. F. A.

I am especially proud to salute the achievement of an 18-year-old Future Farmer of my home county, Ray Tucker, of Antlers, who became the first eastern Oklahoma farm youth to receive the Governor's trophy awarded for outstanding achievement in farming, when he was so honored at a banquet in Stillwater, Okla., on the occasion of the seventeenth annual State F. F. A. convention held Friday, April 23. I commend him for the ability and courage he has shown in taking over active management of the 1,500-acre ranch formerly operated by his father who died about a year ago.

I believe the creed of the Future Farmers of America is worth repeating here:

I believe in the future of farming, with a faith not born of words but of deeds—achievements won by the present and past generations of farmers; in the promise of better days through better ways, even as the better things we now enjoy have come up to us from the struggles of former years.

I believe that to live and work on a good farm is pleasant as well as challenging; for I know the joys and discomforts of farm life and hold an inborn fondness for those associations which, even in hours of discouragement, I cannot deny.

I believe in leadership from ourselves and respect from others. I believe in my own ability to work efficiently and think clearly, with such knowledge and skill as I can secure, and in the ability of organized farmers to serve our own and the public interest in marketing the product of our toil. I believe we can safeguard those rights against practices and policies that are unfair.

I believe in less dependence or begging and more power in bargaining; in the life abundant and enough honest wealth to help make it so—for others as well as myself; in less need for charity and more of it when needed; in being happy myself and playing square with those whose happiness depends upon me.

I believe that rural America can and will hold true to the best traditions in our national life and that I can exert an influence in my home and community which will stand solid for my part in that inspiring task.

The Future Farmers of America have supported the war effort with great energy and telling efficiency. They have invested \$193,145.17 in War bonds and stamps. They have collected 7,453,384 pounds of scrap metal. They have collected 295,425 pounds of rubber. They have collected 132,081 pounds of scrap paper. They have collected 21,989 pounds of rags. They have collected 25,256 burlap bags for making sand barricades. They have turned over their farm repair shops for the vitally necessary work of repairing farm machinery in the State. Many of their number, of course, have joined the various branches of the armed service.

Perhaps, more significantly for the purpose of this discussion, they have met

the Nation's request for a 9-percent increase in the production of livestock this year. And remember that they hold most of this livestock now, at the mercy of the market chaos caused by the confusion in the field of meat regulation.

I have here a statement from Mr. J. B. Perky, State Supervisor of Agricultural Education in Oklahoma, who is largely responsible for the direction of the program of the Future Farmers of America in my State. He says:

Confusion, doubt, and fear have gripped Oklahoma livestock farmers since the hold-the-line order in April. The reduction of more than 50 percent in numbers of cattle marketed in Oklahoma during the current week, as compared to the same week a year ago, attests the validity of this statement. Prices in Oklahoma's only terminal market broke from \$1 to \$2 during the week ending June 19, and a further break would have resulted had not the marketward movement practically ceased. The same condition exists at all other Midwest markets.

Livestock farmers were asked to increase beef production. They have done this short-handed and largely on borrowed capital. They must consider their creditors when contemplating sales.

Serious, also, is the pending liquidation of cow herds. Liquidation is inevitable because of the high cost and scarcity of labor, protein supplements, hay, and grain. Herds cannot be wintered on present prices of labor and feed, when farmers are to bear the brunt of the roll-back proposed.

Feeders are unable to plan dry-lot operations for next fall. This will seriously affect the fate of our Oklahoma calf crop. The confusion is pathetic. Instead of an incentive being given to livestock farmers in the form of a fair price, they are expected to turn their cattle to a market regulated without regard to their plight.

A 10-year livestock improvement program of the Future Farmers of America in Oklahoma is definitely imperiled.

And I wish to salute that other great organization that is doing so much for the farm youth of my State, my district, and my home county. I wish to salute the 51,000 boys and girls, 4-H Club members, in the State of Oklahoma and their leaders; the 9,588 members in my district, the 460 in my home county of Pushmataha.

The author, Pearl Buck, in one of her recent books quotes the Chinese poet, Wang Wei, who lived 4,000 years ago, and was asked what is the most worthwhile thing in life. He answered:

I am old,
Nothing interests me now;
Moreover, I am not very intelligent,
And my ideas
Have never traveled farther than my feet.
You ask me
What is the supreme happiness here below?
It is listening to the song of a little girl
As she goes down the road
After having asked me the way.

4-H Club leaders in Oklahoma and in the Nation are teaching farm youth the way—the way to better homes, to better farms, to better lives.

The purpose of 4-H Clubs this year has been to expand the wartime 4-H Club program with a view of assisting 4-H Club members in making a maximum contribution to the war effort. Only those projects and activities that will contribute to the war effort have been

retained and nonessential contests and State activities have been eliminated.

In the wartime program the 4-H Club members' theme is "Produce and Conserve." Every 4-H Club member who enlists in the 4-H Victory project commits himself to carry out the following objectives: First. To purchase War bonds and stamps. According to a recent report, the 4-H Club members in Oklahoma personally own \$438,758 in War bonds and stamps.

Second. They have agreed to assist with any Government approved scrap drive. According to 1942 reports 4-H Club members collected 13,440,689 pounds of scrap metal; gathered 326,223 pounds of paper, burlap and old rags; and collected 1,196,978 pounds of scrap rubber.

Third. They have agreed to assist in alleviating the farm and home labor problems by doing certain specified work in the home and on the farm. For example, the younger club boys and girls will drive tractors in place of older brothers who have gone into the service. The girls have taken on new responsibilities by planning the family canning budget, by planning and serving nutritious meals, and by taking full responsibility for the home garden. Reports show that in Oklahoma 9,270 club members are taking the full responsibility for the care and management of the home poultry flock.

In addition to carrying out the objectives of the 4-H victory project, 4-H Club members have committed themselves to carry out one or more production or conservation projects. Particular emphasis has been placed upon the meat production, poultry, dairying and dairy production, and gardening. Since January 1 of this year, livestock club members have fed out and marketed 2,940 calves, 9,487 pigs, and 1,323 lambs, which figures only represent a portion of the livestock being produced this year by 4-H Club members. In the poultry club, 9,317 members own 277,826 head of poultry. In the 4-H dairy project 4-H Club members own and care for 3,126 producing animals, along with 3,393 heifers not yet in production, or a total of 6,519 dairy animals. There is a greater interest in the production of gardens this year than ever before. Records show that 40,107 4-H Club members are growing victory gardens.

4-H Club girls are redoubling their efforts this year to can and conserve all the fruits, vegetables, and meats possible in order to release the maximum amount of food possible to our fighting men in the armed services and to our allies as well.

The boys and girls of the Oklahoma 4-H Clubs are now engaged in a great buy-a-bomber campaign, promoting the sale of War bonds and stamps. A huge squadron of four-engine bombers bearing the name of each county whose 4-H Club members sell \$300,000 in War bonds and stamps during this campaign this summer will join the show when the boys go back to bomb Berlin and Tokyo.

According to officials of the State and national War bond offices, Oklahoma's 4-H buy-a-bomber campaign is the larg-

est campaign of its kind yet undertaken during the war. Already 11 of these bombers have been purchased by the boys and girls in this great drive.

One of the most valuable programs to the war effort undertaken by the 4-H Clubs of Oklahoma is the farm-to-market livestock project. This is a project of State-wide scope, sponsored by the Extension Service of the Oklahoma A. & M. College and supervised by the county agents for farm boys and girls, 10 to 20 years of age, who are interested in the production, management, feeding, and marketing of calves, pigs, and lambs. The objectives of the program are:

First. To encourage practical methods of feeding market classes of livestock to meet county farm goals without regard to premiums or prizes.

Second. To assist farm boys and girls in making a real contribution to the food-for-freedom program.

Third. To emphasize the use of home-grown feeds and pastures through the feeding of livestock produced on the home farm or other available classes of feeder animals that may be purchased at current prices.

Fourth. To offer to the young feeders an opportunity to accompany their livestock to market to observe and study marketing practices and procedures.

Fifth. To train farm boys and girls who participate in the project to keep accurate production and marketing records.

This project is intended to assist young farmers to establish themselves in the practical production of market livestock as an integral part of their farming operations. They will be encouraged to keep quality heifers, gilts, and ewes for the purpose of producing high-quality livestock for the market.

Yes; these young patriots of the Future Farmers of America and the 4-H Clubs are making a tremendous contribution to victory. The contribution they will make to the peace which follows will be tremendous. These boys and girls, young men and young women, are keeping the faith. Let us keep faith with them. In this hour when one of the chief problems of economy and finance is how to siphon off the excess buying power in the hands of our citizens, let us not plunge these young people into bankruptcy and despair and throw upon the scrap heap the fine work of a generation of farm youth by making them supply our meat at less than the cost of production. Let us stand firm on the action we have heretofore taken. Let us remember with that anonymous farmer-poet that—

The king may rule over land and sea.
The lord may live right loyally
The soldier rides in pomp and pride,
The sailor roams o'er ocean wide;
But this or that, what 'ere befall
The farmer must feed them all.

The writer thinks: The poet sings,
The craftsmen fashion wondrous things;
The doctor heals, the lawyer pleads,
The miner follows the precious leads;
But this or that, what 'ere befall
The farmer must feed them all.

The merchant he may buy and sell,
The teacher do his duty well;
But man may toil through busy days,
Or man may stroll through pleasant ways;
From king to beggar, what 'ere befall
The farmer must feed them all.

The farmer's trade is one of worth;
He's partner with the sky and earth,
He's partner with the sun and rain;
And no man loses for his gain;
And men may rise and men may fall,
But the farmer must feed them all.

God bless the man who sows the wheat,
Who finds us milk and fruit and meat;
May his purse be heavy, his heart be light,
His cattle and corn and all go right;
God bless the seed his hand let fall,
For the farmer must feed them all.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. GRANT] is recognized for 3 minutes.

GASOLINE RESTRICTIONS IN THE MIDWEST

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution today in the House to investigate the gasoline situation.

Mr. Speaker, from the daily press we read that the District Commissioners have refused to turn the Police Department over to the O. P. A. to carry on a huge entrapment program directed against motorists. What is the authority under which these snoopers set out upon a program of indiscriminate detention of the Nation's motorists? Is every man who drives a car these days presumed in the eyes of O. P. A. to be guilty of violating its countless rules and regulations?

What has happened to the doctrine that a man is presumed to be innocent until he has been tried and proven guilty? From whence comes this new-fangled idea that every man who drives a car is guilty until he explains to the satisfaction of an O. P. A. snooper the fact that he is on legitimate business?

What has happened to our constitutional guaranty against unreasonable search and seizure if every man on the O. P. A. pay roll assumes the right to station himself at the street corner and stop our citizens in their ordinary pursuits of life and demand to know the whys and the wherefore of their use of an automobile?

This same un-American program is creeping into the Middle West. Praise the Lord, for the courage of a man like acting Governor Goodland, of Wisconsin, who warned that he would not tolerate this invasion of the rights of American citizens by the O. P. A. in the State of Wisconsin.

We have not heard much for several days concerning the threatened spread of the O. P. A. ban on what they call pleasure driving to the Middle West, but many people in my section of the country are concerned lest the O. P. A. is quietly preparing to swoop down and crack down upon them.

If further restrictions in the use of gasoline in the Midwest are justified, our people will be ready and willing to accept them, but no justification whatever has been shown for any such action, and I

feel that we ought to get at the bottom of all of these uncertainties and threats.

I have today introduced a resolution calling for an investigation of the petroleum situation, particularly as it affects the Midwest. Let us have a fair and complete and impartial investigation and really get at the bottom of this thing. Is it a shortage of rubber or of gasoline or of transportation? Or is the Middle West to be a happy hunting ground for further bureaucratic regimentation of a free people?

Let us have a man of the caliber of Mr. Bernard Baruch head a committee to investigate this matter thoroughly and report to the American people. If the situation calls for further restrictions, our people are ready and willing to accept the verdict. If it does not, let us cut out all the clamor and all the threats.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BLAND, for 10 days, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2714. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution relating to the marketing of burley and flue-cured tobacco, under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2349. An act to adjust the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States;

H. R. 2714. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2943. An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government;

H. R. 3026. An act relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts;

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas; and

H. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution relating to the marketing of burley and flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, July 5, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

534. A letter from the Administrative Officer, the White House, transmitting in accordance with Public Law 49 and Budget Circular No. 421, the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements (Budget Bureau No. 80-R001) for the White House Office; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

535. A letter from the Chief Clerk, the American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the American Battle Monuments Commission for the quarter ending September 30, 1943, which was submitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

536. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting information required in compliance with Budget Circular No. 421, of May 31, 1943, for the purpose of making the determination of the number of employees necessary for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the Federal Works Agency; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

537. A letter from the Administrative Officer, Board of Investigation and Research, transmitting quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

538. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a copy of a report covering the personnel requirements of this agency for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

539. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements on Form Budget Bureau No. 80-R001 prescribed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for the purpose of determining the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of this agency during the quarter beginning July 1, 1943, and ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

540. A letter from the Acting Director, the Office of Censorship, transmitting proposed personnel limitations for the Office of Censorship for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

541. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting an estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

542. A letter from the Chairman, National War Labor Board, transmitting a quarterly estimate of the personnel requirements of the National War Labor Board for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944, in compliance with section 11 of Public Law No. 49, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 7, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

543. A letter from the acting executive officer, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting its estimate for the quarter ending September 30, 1943, of its minimum personnel requirements to perform its duties under Public No. 284, Seventy-first Congress (46 Stat. 482), approved May 29, 1930; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

544. A letter from the Chairman and Administrator, War Shipping Administration and United States Maritime Commission, transmitting a copy of his letter, with attachments, of even date to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget transmitting quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for the

period ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

545. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements of the National Labor Relations Board for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts, House Resolution 284. Resolution authorizing the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 98, Seventy-eighth Congress, by Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, without amendment (Rept. No. 659). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report from the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum Investigation pursuant to House Resolution 290, Seventy-sixth Congress, House Resolution 383, Seventy-seventh Congress, and House Resolution 58 of the Seventy-eighth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 663). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts, House Resolution 285. Resolution authorizing the appropriation of \$5,000 for the investigation authorized by House Resolution 262; without amendment (Rept. No. 664). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. S. 159. An act for the relief of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio; without amendment (Rept. No. 646). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. S. 426. An act for the relief of Maj. George E. Golding; without amendment (Rept. No. 647). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. S. 462. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo; without amendment (Rept. No. 648). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. S. 626. An act for the relief of Angeline Arbuckle; without amendment (Rept. No. 649). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. S. 652. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Lassiter; without amendment (Rept. No. 650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. S. 787. An act for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Harry Jacobs; without amendment (Rept. No. 651). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. S. 824. An act for the relief of Dr. J. W. Goin; without amendment (Rept. No. 652). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 852. A bill for the relief of John T. Shirley; without amendment (Rept. No. 653). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 977. A bill for the relief of Clare A. Miller; with amendment (Rept. No. 654). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1666. A bill for the relief of Helen Engell Thompson; with amendment (Rept. No. 655). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1973. A bill for the relief of Albert Ferguson and Ozelle Ferguson; with amendment (Rept. No. 656). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2340. A bill for the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 657). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1435. A bill for the relief of Lillian C. Ferreira; with amendment (Rept. No. 658). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 3117. A bill to provide that the tax upon the use of motor vehicles shall not be applicable after July 1, 1943; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 3118. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work on Lytle and Cajon Creeks, Calif.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 3119. A bill to provide for certain payments to States and their political subdivisions as compensation for loss of revenues occasioned by the acquisition of real property by the United States for military purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 3120. A bill to provide for the issuance of a United States flag to the nearest relative of a member of the Army of the United States who dies in service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution to amend section 5 of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to cause an investigation and report to be made with respect to the existing petroleum situation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. Res. 288. Resolution to provide for additional compensation for Leslie M. Rapp, minority clerk of the Ways and Means Committee of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. FISH:

H. Res. 289. Resolution authorizing appointment of a special committee to study ceiling prices on hogs and corn, in order to curb inflation; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to enact any legislation which has for its purposes any change in the fundamental concept of the constitutional form of government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 3121 (by request). A bill for the relief of S. H. Brown and M. Brown, also known as the Universal Steamship Co., a Georgia corporation, to cover the loss of their bark *Brown Brothers*, destroyed by a German raider during the World War; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 3122 (by request). A bill for the relief of Universal Steamship Co. for losses sustained due to the interruption of a voyage of the American schooner *Ninetta M. Porcella*, by reason of a Presidential proclamation, effective September 28, 1917, forbidding sailing vessels from entering the war zone; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3123. A bill for the relief of Samuel Stacey; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 3124. A bill for the relief of Anthony Sammartino; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3125. A bill for the relief of Paul H. White; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 3126. A bill for the relief of Mary Ellen Frakes, widow of Joseph A. Frakes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 3127. A bill for the relief of Drapery Hardware Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1843. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of 20 citizens of the State of Iowa, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1844. By Mr. FELLOWS: Petition of Geneva Rossignol and 6 others, of Caribou; L. S. Ginn and 28 others, of Caribou; and Mabel D. Russell and 24 others, of Danforth, Maine, in regard to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1845. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of sundry citizens of Washington County, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1846. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 21 residents of Bad Axe, Mich., urging the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic beverages during the war in order to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of war materials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1847. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of Blanche A. Gasler and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture,

sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1848. Also, petition of Daisie Cox and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1849. Also, petition of Minnie Traut and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1850. Also, petition of Grace I. Stewart and 11 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1851. Also, petition of Ruth Brakefield and 20 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1852. Also, petition of Margaret Hoover and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1843. Also, petition of H. E. McVay and 18 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1854. Also, petition of Mrs. D. H. Schedin and 18 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1855. Also, petition of Myra I. Evans and 20 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1856. Also, petition of Ida Olive and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1857. Also, petition of Mrs. E. J. Dumphy and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war

1887. Also, petition of Ida M. Black and 28 other residents of Wenatchee and vicinity, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1888. Also, petition of Jessie Patrick and 27 other residents of Wenatchee and vicinity, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1889. Also, petition of Olive M. Buttles and 17 other residents of Wenatchee, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1890. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Pearl Danner and 19 other residents of Wenatchee, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1891. Also, petition of Hazel J. Reed and 28 other residents of Wenatchee, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1892. Also, petition of H. C. Barrigan and 15 other residents of Wenatchee, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1893. Also, petition of R. J. Carlson and 32 other residents of Wenatchee, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1894. Also, petition of Robert Lincoln Kelley and 35 other residents of Waterville, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1895. Also, petition of Nona Andre and 23 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1896. Also, petition of R. D. Bishop and 17 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1897. Also, petition of Jessie M. Snodgrass and 20 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1898. Also, petition of Mrs. Elmer Herr and 33 other residents of Pateros, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1899. Also, petition of Virginia Layton and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1900. Also, petition of Effie M. Johnson and 19 other residents of Spokane, favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1901. Also, petition of Selma Hitchen and 37 other residents of Spokane, requesting Congress to stop the sale of intoxicating drinks in Army camps and around them; and to make provision to clean up adjacent cities, if the constituted authorities do not, thus keeping temptation from our men and boys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 5, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God and ours, on the birthday of national independence we confess our dependence upon Thee. Without Thee we are lost in spite of the overwhelming might of our material arms.

We thank Thee for those pilgrims of faith who came hither in their frail barque across mountainous seas and who stepped upon strange shores with the salutation to a new world, "In the name of God. Amen." The Nation here established, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal has acknowledged that Name above every name and revered it, has built its altars, reared its temples, and raised its steeples, emblems of a faith that points to the skies and wings its sure and certain way to God. Make that faith of the fathers, we pray, real to us in these tempestuous days. Save us from a freedom of speech so empty that we have nothing worth saying, from a freedom of worship so futile that we have no God to adore, from freedom from want

and fear with no creative idea as to how to use our plenty or our security for the redemption of our social order and for the salvation of our own souls. Let all that is low and unworthy in us sink to the depths. Let all that is high and fine in us rise to greet the morn of a new day confident that the best is yet to be. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Saturday, July 3, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On July 1, 1943:

S. 495. An act to establish a Women's Army Corps for service in the Army of the United States; and

S. 650. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.," approved February 10, 1932.

On July 3, 1943:

S. 832. An act relating to the sale of horse meat or food products thereof in the District of Columbia; and

S. 1026. An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 24, 25, and 32 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 to the bill and concurred therein with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 33 and 34 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1991) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school